



From the collection of the

J f d  
x y z n m k  
o Preinger a h  
u v q g Library  
e b t s w p c

San Francisco, California  
2007





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation





January—February, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

Dictatorship or a Free Earth

Harry Weinberger

Prosperity a Normal Condition

Henry J. Foley

Land Value and Its Taxation

Henry L. T. Tideman

Are Conventions Worth While?

P. R. Williams

Book Reviews    Correspondence    News Notes and Personals

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress  
Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 170 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

## JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 1 WHOLE No. 188

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: A. Mathew ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,

Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	3
DICTATORSHIP OR SINGLE TAX.....Harry Weinberger	6
PROSPERITY—A NORMAL CONDITION..... Henry J. Foley	9
REFORMERS, RESPECTABILITY AND OFFICITIS .....Frank Chodorov	14
LAND VALUE AND ITS TAXATION. . . Henry L. T. Tideman	16
THE ONLY PERMANENT CURE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT .....J. C. Lincoln	17
WAYS AND MEANS.....Address by Anna George de Mille	19
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.....	21
REPORT OF THE ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION..... Antoinette Kauffmann	23
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE....	24
ARE CONVENTIONS WORTH WHILE?.....P. R. Williams	25
PITTSBURGH NEWS.....	28
BOOK REVIEWS.....Grace Isabel Colbron and J. D. M.	28
CORRESPONDENCE.....	31
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	36

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1935

No. 1

## Comment and Reflection

IT is interesting to reflect how little real thought has characterized this era of experimentation. In all the linguistic fulminations and the stream of books that have come from the professorial groups prominent in the New Deal, how small is the element of reflection, of appeals to historic precedents, of research into the reasons for the failure of like social experiments with which the annals of nations are crowded. Not only have the advocates of democracy failed to voice their protests against the demonstrable economic errors of the present, but our scholarship, which might have drawn important lessons from the past, is silent as the grave. Everywhere we look we fail to discover a single eminent thinker whose words are sufficiently arresting to merit attention in this crisis. What is the matter with our system of education that so much of what we see everywhere in our legislative halls should go unchallenged?

HERE is another thought. Every generation provides its quota of economic works. We might say every decade. And ever so often these works are hailed by certain groups as epoch-making. But almost as quickly they are pushed off their eminence and drop into oblivion. Looking back into the late nineties we remember a few names that are as dead as last year's snows. Grunlund, Van Buren Denslow, George Gunton, Blatchford—conservatives and socialists alike—with many others that could be named are all forgotten. Yet what a noise they created in their day! Is there any greater assurance that Lippman, (though right once out of four times) Tugwell, Stuart Chase, Berle, Seligman, and all the flock of hybrid economists will meet with a dissimilar fate? Is there any difference between these men and their rather more popular and certainly more widely read predecessors? They are even duller, or most of them are, than those now consigned to oblivion. And they are a great deal more shallow.

THE trouble with them is that they do not know what they are writing about. Some of them are clever, but they have no fundamental knowledge of the things or laws they treat of. They have never really studied these problems. The very principles that would solve most of their difficulties are unknown to them. The few

who survive from earlier groups of economic thinkers are those who have in some measure contributed to principles. Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill emerge triumphantly and still survive. But how small is the number who merit even a second thought! Read Blanqui's *History of Political Economy* and note the names of those economists who spoiled much white paper and are now swallowed up. It reads like the epitaphs in a deserted cemetery. And if you look at what they wrote you will realize why they aroused the somewhat unreasoning anger of Thomas Carlyle. "Dismal" he called them. And you will have an answer to their disappearance.

AND because the writers of today on the problems of political economy and social science are all earmarked for oblivion—those we have named and legions of others—it behooves us rather to express sympathy than vent our anger upon them. For a veritable massacre at the hands of posterity awaits them. Let them not deceive themselves. The reputations of the nineties were greater than theirs by many degrees. And the time will come when even the casual reflections of Henry George will outweigh the tons of rubbish turned out in the name of social planning and economic philosophy.

A REVIEW by R. L. Duffus in the *New York Times Book Review* of recent date describes conditions prevailing in the Lowell cotton mills of years ago. The reviewer notes a report of a committee of the legislature which expressed the opinion that no legislation could provide a remedy, adding: "We look for it in the progressive development in the arts and sciences, in a higher appreciation of man's destiny, in a less love for money and a more ardent love for social happiness and intellectual superiority." This piously sloppy comment may give rise to a smile, but what shall we say of the reviewer who adds: "The profit system, as we might have foreseen, survived this insidious assault."

OF all the terms used to cloud understanding nothing quite equals "the profit system" unless it be "the capitalistic system." That at this time sixty years ago girls worked for twelve hours a day in the Lowell cotton mills at two dollars a week was due to something deeper than "the profit system," as "the profit system," so called, is due to something deeper still. That girls worked this

way for a meagre pittance was not due to the desire of the employers to make profits, but to the fact that labor was disinherited, and that the labor market was crowded. And the labor market was crowded because there were always enough girls out of work to provide the employer with a surplus to draw upon.

**C**ONDITIONS were deplorable in the Lowell mills at that day and are still deplorable. But we are to remember that two dollars per week, which salaries were pitiable enough, were what six or eight dollars would mean today. There has been no great change in conditions. It is very likely that conditions are even slightly harder and more unbearable, though working hours have been somewhat reduced and surroundings somewhat improved. But at any rate wages in 1840 or of 1934 are not dependent upon what Mr. Duffus calls "the profit system," but in the number of girls out of work bidding for the jobs of those employed.

**T**HE employer is not going to pay more than the market rate of wages, and these are not fixed by the desire of employers to secure profits, but upon labor conditions, chief among which is the number of men and women out of work, sufficient at all times to depress wages to the point of subsistence.

**T**O ask an employer to raise wages above the rate at which labor can be secured is to ask him to commit business suicide. He cannot pay higher wages than his competitors and continue in business. In exceptional instances he may be able to do this. Not so with the majority of employers. Employers everywhere are as much victims of the system as those who have only their labor. Both have to sacrifice a measure of their production, the wages of labor and the wages of superintendence—which is all there is in "the profit system"—to a third party who contributes nothing but land, which was here before Columbus, and the value of which the community creates.

**W**E do not have to invent terms for this partnership. It is all very obvious to those who will think. Mr. Duffus is quite capable of discerning it if he will. Let him ask himself how production can be carried on successfully with equitable shares going to this ill-assorted partnership. If a third partner who contributes nothing to industry levies upon this joint production less remains for those who make the entire contribution. Something must be deducted for the benefit of one who has no creative part or function in production.

**T**HE Lowell mill owner or any other employer does not create this condition. The economic doctors at Washington have done a great deal to confuse the prob-

lem by code regulation of prices, and code regimentation, and have led our people to forget the natural forces at work, and to ignore the functions of a very simple problem. Not one of these economic doctors has risen to the occasion with cries of "stop thief" to the absconding partner in this strangely assorted company of labor, capitalists and landlord. Indeed their very effort seems to be to conceal the social crime of this barefaced embezzlement. To further bewilder our citizens curious verbal inventions that have no relation to realities are conjured up like "the profit system," or "the capitalistic system"—phrases borrowed from the socialists—that cloud the understanding, as we have said, and obscure the perfectly simple operation of an economic pocket-picking that goes on everywhere in the domain of industry.

**T**HERE are three factors in production, land, labor and capital. There are three returns, rent, wages and interest. "Profits" is a bookkeeping term, but usually, as we have said, comprise or consist of the wages of superintendence. The proprietor of a store may receive all three returns, but the wages of superintendence, "profits" so-called, are his chief concern. And where his wages are high all wages are high. His profits are his wages when they are not economic rent. How absurd then to talk of "the profit system" when it is the wages system that is meant. And to advocate the abolition of the profit system is to advocate the abolition of wages, for anything that hits at the institution of profits is directed against all wages. Monopoly profits secured by the action of government in shutting out competition through patents or land ownership are another thing again, and are easily separable from real or legitimate profits. This will be made perfectly clear on analysis.

**I**N the arena of sports we at least hear the question, "Is it fair?" It comes up in prize fighting, horseracing and base ball. "Is it fair?" Unless men and women ask themselves the question in the field of economics there will be no change. Justice, however, is a hardy virtue. It is a virtue of full grown men, not a civilization grown anaemic from long-time coddling under a wet nurse government. This government has visualized a citizenry that needs to be taken care of, rather than one to be set free. We shall perhaps pass through this era to one that will ask "Is it fair?" As justice not charity is the supreme law, justice demands a free earth not one in which we must pay others to live on or from.

**T**HROUGH public speeches and writings Secretary Ickes has urged what he calls "stronger control over the economic forces that affect the common man." Economic forces, being presumably natural forces, are not susceptible of control by anybody, neither by govern-

ment nor by the individual. They may be followed or obeyed, but they are not obedient to any impertinent suggestion from us as to how they should behave. Economic forces have a way of their own; to try to control them is like trifling with a buzz saw. Pretty nearly all our troubles are due to attempted interference with them. To illustrate: It is an economic law that man seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion. But we erect tariff walls to make it difficult to satisfy desires without a great deal of exertion, and above all we fence the land away from him, which makes it well nigh impossible to gratify any desire without great sacrifice. We constantly violate economic laws or forces, to our great sorrow and confusion, be it added.

SECRETARY ICKES is especially angry with the advocates of "rugged individualism." It is instructive to note how many well meaning emotionalists are under the tyranny of words. We exalt the "rugged individualism" of the pilgrims, of those who blazed the pathway to the great untrodden West. We still use the names of Daniel Boone and Sam Houston and many others. And the characteristics of those national heroes which we most admire are their rugged individualism. It was not until the Roosevelt administration that subtle assault upon the language began which seems gradually destined to deflate the meaning of terms. If we oppose any of the features of "economic planning" we are "Tories." The men who propose to hamstring industry are called "liberals," and those who question the wisdom of much that is being done or who would revert to the older and freer traditions of our country, are set down as "reactionaries." Has language no meaning any more? Must we accept new definitions in lieu of the old? Must we relinquish the dictionaries?

THEY are all alike, these strange planners who would ignore the plans of nature, economic laws planned from the beginning of the world. Listen to Mr. Ickes: "The meaning of the word liberty varies with time and circumstance. It may be said that the more civilized we become the greater must be the restriction placed upon the individual for the common good." And Mr. Richberg, who belongs to the same school of thinkers, referring to the critics of the New Deal: "They talk as though all rights were inherent in the individual. They are not. The rights of property did not come by nature, they were created by law."

JUST the contrary is true. All rights are inherent in the individual. It is not possible for government to create a right of property. That right began when the man of the stone age sharpened a piece of flint to spear a fish for his dinner and called that sharpened flint and

the fish his own. The rights of property exercised by government flow from the individual in whom all rights are inherent. Such rights as are exercised by government are *delegated rights*. It is quite clear that the social philosophy of the doctors at Washington is not only undemocratic—it is un-American. We venture to quote from Alexander Hamilton who said:

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments and musty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of Divinity itself and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

WHAT is the real trouble with them we think we know. Let us quote Mr. Ickes again and see where his mental trouble is. He says: "It is easy to excuse these pioneer forefathers of ours who seeing before them apparently illimitable natural resources, proceeded to exploit these resources. We cannot hold it against them that they failed to foresee the seemingly inexhaustible provided by the bounty of nature would be nearing the point of exhaustion."

THESE inexhaustible natural resources are still practically inexhaustible. They have almost neared the point of *total appropriation*, but that is another matter. They may be recovered by any generation that has the wisdom and the courage to try it. And they will be. Nothing is more certain than the ultimate recovery of our natural resources by the people to whom they belong by that inherent right of property which both Mr. Ickes and Mr. Richberg fail to discern. These inherent rights are the right of property in what the individual creates and the right of the community to the value it creates, a right of property not law-created but inherent in the individual.

HOW both Mr. Ickes and Mr. Richberg come without meaning to do so to the defense of communism! For if the right of property rests only in the creation of man-made law then there is no real reply to communism. We shall not, however, so soon abandon the case. We will leave communism to its latest advocates, and we are sure that the well meaning groups of our communist friends who are blackguarded and defended in turn, will appreciate the arguments of their latest protagonists who tell them after all there is no real rights of property save that which the law creates. But ere the communist party proceeds to act upon the advice given them by their latest defenders, Messrs. Ickes and Richberg, we appeal to the communists to reflect that there is a sacred right of property that depends upon the creative right to the thing produced, a right of the individual's access to the earth, and the public's right to the public values it creates.

THIS is to be considered. As it is something not well understood it may be desirable to stress it. *If Roosevelt should succeed he must fail.* It is not possible of course to bring us out of the depression through the adoption of the devices entered into by the administration at Washington. But it is conceivable that natural forces may work something of revival to be followed by another era of depression, deeper and more general than that through which we are passing. For such temporary revival Roosevelt partisans will claim all the credit and he will be acclaimed as the great leader who has conquered the depression. But all to no purpose as time proceeds and the destructive forces again get in their work.

IT is all very simple to those who will study the matter. Land values are the lifeblood of the community. Normally they are beneficent in their operations. Business generally can carry the normal economic rent. Instead of being a burden on industry rent determines the most profitable locations where industry can be carried on. It marks the arteries of a city's commerce and determines the sites of a city's activities, the direction of its transit lines, the distribution of its population. Rents are the natural planning or the natural direction of it.

ANYTHING that interferes with the normal pulsation of land values through a city's arteries causes a disarrangement and interruption of the orderly processes of industry. The whole natural process is now destroyed and will not work because of the element now introduced. Speculation now sets in, and this speculation in rental values strikes at the very heart of the well-being of a community. An element is introduced destructive of all normal development. Industry is now called upon to pay in excess of the normal rent. There is less for interest and wages and more for the silent partner who contributes nothing to production, the receiver of economic rent, now speculative rent. Capital and wages face diminishing returns. Failures and bankruptcies follow and these results occurring from the same cause in other cities where similar phenomena are taking place, produce depressions. Finally the lifeblood of the community, land values, runs sterile.

THIS is the terrible cycle in which communities are involved. There is no remedy save the absorption by society of those social values which society creates, making forever impossible the recurrence of the present dislocation of industry and wide spread unemployment. This can be done through the taxing power. And at the same time all taxes which bear so hardly on industry can be abolished, and their abolition is the other half of the answer to the problem or solution for the condition in which we find ourselves. This need not be done at once

perhaps but can be done gradually, and with every step in the process capital and labor will be lightened of its burden.

## Dictatorship or Single Tax<sup>1</sup>

By HARRY WEINBERGER, of the New York Bar

A PEOPLE who are an-hungered cannot stay free. Occasional brave souls may starve and struggle to the end to maintain liberty and democracy. Large groups may fight while starving, and die in the struggle, it being: "A short life in the saddle, Lord, Not a long life by the fire."

For an entire nation, unemployment and starvation however will lead that nation inevitably to accept dictatorship in preference to hunger; whether that dictatorship is in the form of Fascism, Naziism or Communism.

Today the American people are engaged in a great struggle against economic depression—a struggle as great as the Revolution of 1776, a struggle as depressing as the Civil War of 1861, a struggle in some ways for millions of our people as horrible as the World War. If hunger and unemployment continue, will the blind Samson of hunger pull down the Temple of Civilization?

This present depression is testing whether our nation conceived in liberty, faced with world economic forces, can long endure without a dictator. Nation after nation has succumbed to regimentation or civil war. Will history recall that our democracy as well as that of other nations was only a passing phase to mark the transition from the divine right of kings to dictatorship?

Shall we allow that it is necessary to set aside the principles of individual freedom and regiment a nation in order to promote experiments to improve economic conditions. A small group in Russia, by force and terror, took from its people liberty, and promised to return it some day. More than fifteen years have elapsed since that time and liberty has not been returned to the Russian people. The Fascists of Italy and the Nazis of Germany have taken away liberty without even a promise of its return. They liquidate their opponents in Russia, castor-oil-ize them in Italy, shoot them in Germany, put them in a Code in the United States as the opening step for a regimented nation. Only three of the great nations of the world are still really democratic—England, France and the United States.

If we have now in the United States a government of men and not law, if the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing freedom, protecting private property, protecting contracts, has been abolished or is in the process of being abolished, tomorrow or next year

<sup>1</sup>This address of Harry Weinberger was sent to the Henry George Congress after he found it impossible to attend. Owing to the great amount of business before the sessions it was not read.—Editor: LAND AND FREEDOM.

instead of a mild idealistic President, we may have a dictator who will end all liberty, having been taught by an idealistic President how to regiment the people by force and fear in a time of depression and unemployment. Senator Borah well said:

"Precedents established by capable hands for desirable purposes are still precedents for incapable hands and undesirable purposes."

Life even with all economic questions solved, if without liberty, would be like a rope of sand which perishes in the twisting.

Every form of dictatorship in whatever guise it may come, must be resisted to the bitter end. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. This has been said thousands of times but always needs repeating, and never more than now.

It is better to die on fighting feet than to live on bended knees. We must not listen to men on bended knees—those who do so cannot judge the size of other men.

We must however solve the unemployment problem; solve the bread question, the cost of living question; the decent housing question, or people and nations in panic and desperation may continue to flock to dictators like frightened children. The youths of the United States stand helpless and hopeless asking for jobs, and in the most fertile land in the world, blessed with all the raw material necessary and the finest engineering science, marvelous roads and railroads, with millions of acres of land unused, trade stands still and millions are eating the bread of charity who never ate it before. Taxes are mounting higher and higher, taxes in every form; and once proud cities and states are turning to the Federal Government for aid lest they perish or go bankrupt.

In the meanwhile, almost without exception, cities, counties and states allow the unearned increment of land which is created by all the people to be taken by private individuals; it allows land to be held out of use waiting for a speculative rise in price; it fails to take for community needs the full rental value of the bare land which was created by no man, which act alone would force all land into its fullest economic use, create more jobs than men, raise wages, reduce the cost of living, lower rents, and abolish all relief rolls except for the old and feeble or incapacitated.

There can be no overproduction; there is only underconsumption. Today we have wonderful machinery making too much clothing so that millions are without clothes and without jobs. We have agriculture that produces so much wheat and corn and fruits and vegetables that millions have to go hungry; we have so many houses that millions are homeless. There is no limit to human consumptive power; there is only underconsumption caused by inability to purchase. There is no man, no matter how poor or how wealthy who cannot use hundreds of things, who would not like to own and use more of the

bare necessities of life, from simple bread to fine cake, from simple clothes to elaborate clothes, from newspapers to fine books, from ordinary pictures to masterpieces, from a simple harmonica to a fine violin, from an old tin-can piano to a grand piano, from a tallow candle to an electric light, from a one horse shay to the latest airplane or automobile, from a row-boat to a yacht, from a noisy city apartment to a beautiful home in the country.

When we had a tremendous housing shortage in New York City and rents were soaring to the skies, it was proposed that all houses built within a certain period would be tax exempt for ten years; that law of the exemption of houses from taxation was passed. Thousands of houses were built, the housing shortage was solved, hundreds of thousands of people were given jobs directly or indirectly and rents came down.

I need not state any of the usual arguments for Single Tax to most of this audience. However, let me give two examples, for others who may hear or read this address.

In the City of New York the New School for Social Research wanted to build a building on Twelfth street, and they paid two hundred thousand dollars for the mere fee of the land on which to erect the building. No one produced that land—no one except the community produced the value of that land, yet some one pocketed two hundred thousand dollars.

The Wendell home on Fifth Avenue and Thirty-Ninth Street, with its dog yard has been rented to a chain store at a rental of about three hundred thousand dollars a year, so that before labor can be paid a penny in wages, before capital can earn a penny in dividends, three hundred thousand dollars worth of goods must be produced yearly and paid over to the present owners of the land who inherited it from the Wendells.

This situation is repeated millions of times in the United States and often when labor strikes for more wages and shorter hours and capital replies it cannot afford it, then bitter strikes break out, leading to riots, disorder, deaths and the destruction of property. Capital and labor under these circumstances are very much like two Kilkenny cats who have had their tails tied together and are scratching and biting at each other, each thinking the other the enemy, while as a matter of fact, the real enemy is the one who tied their tails together. The enemy of both capital and labor are those who receive the community-created rental values of land.

The law of supply and demand cannot be repealed unless we go under a despotism, whether that despotism is called Communism, Naziism or N. R. A. That road means the destruction of democracy. The people of the United States may vote for it if they want it, for as Abraham Lincoln said in his first inaugural address:

"This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their con-

stitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

The change, however, must not be done by one man or a handful of public officials who were elected with no such mandate from the people, but it must be done by the people themselves.

Let us use all land to its fullest economic use, agricultural, industrial or residential. Let us use the full machine power, all science, all speed, all manpower as if we were at war. Continue under our present system. Tell the people of America that they can build houses, or repair them, build factories or barns, make improvements without having their taxes increased and unemployment will cease in America without begging the banks to make loans.

Break down and pull down the high tariff walls—raze them, so that other nations may do likewise, so that trade and goods may flow through the world again, so that nations will cease to fear that they cannot get raw materials for their people to eat or manufacture. Tariff walls cause nations to want more and more land of their neighbors, and they prepare for war while trade is not free. This preparation for war entails a burden that is like the Old Man of the Sea whom Sinbad carried almost to the point of his destruction.

How many additional men and women are on the public pay-rolls since the New Deal? I am not referring to relief rolls. What is the total amount of their unnecessary salaries? How many people are employed on code enforcements? How much spying is going on, how much added bitterness is being engendered? All of this an added incubus on business, increasing the cost of production, raising the cost of living without raising wages to permit the people to buy. These code authority employees are a new army of seven year locusts who at the expense of the public are eating up a good part of the people's substance. Put them back to useful work.

The American people should never again allow the destruction or limitation of crops or animals; never again allow the United States to adopt an economy of scarcity. A democracy should allow no poverty, no hunger, no involuntary unemployment, for every one in a democracy has an unalienable right to work for a living.

Economic liberty or proper distribution of wealth and the proper forms of taxation has nothing to do with the question of liberty. It has only to do with economics. But only a free people with liberty of speech under a democratic form of government, can change economic conditions by ballots instead of bullets, in order to bring about the happiness of the people, one of the purposes of government as stated in the Declaration of Independence.

Some men in a hurry to save the world before night-fall would dispense with all liberty. We stand against regimentation of the people under any guise or pretext. Voluntary cooperation is not despotism; compulsory cooperation carried too far may be the road to tyranny and tyranny is tyranny. We do not fear economic change—we

do fear the growth of monopolies and loss of liberty. We stand against the despotism of government or men. All changes of government or society should be fully discussed. We are not afraid of paper bullets containing ideas; we are not afraid of verbal shot containing controversial ammunition. It is so easy to sell one's heritage of freedom for a mess of pottage; the necessities, the exigencies seem so great, the sale seems so temporary—the struggle to hold it seems so hopeless, so useless.

You are familiar with the Rubyat of Omar Khayam and know how he describes the sellers of wine and asks:

"Well, I wonder often what the vinters buy  
One half so precious as the stuff they sell."

To paraphrase Omar Khayam, I say to those in panic who are advocating that we sell liberty for a regimented state:

I wonder what they will receive that will  
Be worth half the liberty they sell.

In Chicago at the World's Fair Exposition you may see the Prairie Schooner, also called the Covered Wagon, with its hard wheels and springs and brakes. As you look at it you may think of the men and women, who, because land was free and therefore opportunity was open, rode hundreds of miles in that wagon across country. You may wonder whether the men and women of today would have the courage to travel across a continent in a vehicle like that. Have we been softened by rubber tires, and fine springs on upholstered vehicles? Are we less industrious? Have we with all of electric and steam power less capacity to produce?

We refuse to say with Browning:

"Never glad, confident morning again."

We reply in the words of Bronte:

"No coward's soul is mine,  
No trembler in the world's troubled sphere."

America is appalled at the spread of crime. Crime increases with the increased hazard of living. When young men and young women stand helpless and hopeless without jobs what can government and society expect? When middle age or old age finds itself desperate and in need, characters break under the strain and crime increases. When, added to that situation, there is the invasion of constitutional liberties by the law-enforcing agencies, the third degree, the invasions of homes, the dragnet arrests of alleged agitators or aliens or so-called "reds," all in violation of the law, we realize that the problem of much of all crime cannot be solved by law-enforcing agencies but by abolition of unemployment, starvation wages, the stretch-out system, long hours, but, more important than all, by opening opportunities creating a condition of more jobs than men.

We can care for the unemployed, we can feed the hungry and provide shelter for the homeless without

regimenting the nation in business, without goose-steeping every little industry, without leaving loose a bureaucratic flock of nose-y incompetents running around clothed in brief authority, and with all the thunder of the majesty of the United States government behind them, giving petty orders—with the little man and the little business cracked down upon—while prices keep soaring for the necessities of life and business and individuals carry additional taxes and unemployment continues to grow with the number of those needing relief mounting. Food and grain and cotton and cattle have been destroyed in the past and people by tens of thousands have been paid for doing nothing. The government must take care of the needy. That is part of the duty of government. I defy any lawyer, however, to show any authority in the National Government to pay farmers for not producing, not working.

It is no disgrace nor dishonor to fail in the conflict for justice and liberty. It is only a disgrace and dishonor not to enter the arena and give battle. Democracy and parliamentary government with all its faults is the sole hope of a world seeking a possible solution of economic problems. If depotism conquers it will mould the world in unchangeable form; it will build on the masses for the benefit of only a few.

Luther Burbank once said:

"I shall be content if, because of me,  
there shall be better fruits and fairer flowers."

We should be content if because of our battle for a free earth there shall be better human beings, peace, and the abolition of poverty, liberty and democracy in all the world.

So, take heart; consult your despair, your desperation in a tottering world; take heart for the earth in all its fruitfulness has not been destroyed. Tickle the earth and it will still laugh a harvest. Take heed for the learning and science of mankind, with all of steam and electric power, is still our heritage ready for use. Take heed—what should you fear? Our ancestors came from all parts of the world with courage, facing unknown conditions and dangers, helped clear a continent and established the glory of these United States. Can we do less?

## Liberalism In Being

YES, there is a Liberal Party!

I saw nearly all of it all at once the other day. Three M.P.s stood in a group outside the Eisteddfod pavilion—all Liberals.

They were Captain R. T. Evans, A. O. Roberts and L. Jones. The first estimated, in a talk with me that of the £10,000,000 recently spent on public works in Wales, half had gone to the landlords!

He might not go so far as to admit it, but the logical remedy, of course, is land reform on the Henry George pattern.

HANNEN SWAFFER in London *Daily Herald*.

POLITICAL juggling will not balance a budget.

## Prosperity—

### A Normal Condition

AN EFFORT TO FIND IN LIBERTY A COMMON DENOMINATOR FOR THOSE NOT RESIGNED TO DEPRESSIONS

BY HENRY J. FOLEY

Just what do you mean by prosperity?

I mean a condition in which every man able to work can secure without difficulty the necessities of life, and a reasonable share of the comforts and luxuries.

Is prosperity a condition difficult of attainment?

Prosperity is as normal as breathing. Depression is as unnatural, and should be as unusual as suffocation.

Why do you say that prosperity is a normal condition?

Because men were provided with the earth and its raw materials, from which all their wants may be supplied, just as they are provided with air to breathe; and they are likewise provided with hands to work up these materials, just as they are provided with lungs to breathe the air.

How could the normal condition of breathing be replaced by the unnatural condition of suffocation?

1. By destroying the lungs with which men breathe, or,
2. By shutting off the air which they must put into their lungs.

How could a normal condition of prosperity be replaced by depression and wholesale poverty?

1. By destroying the hands with which men work; or,
2. By keeping men away from the materials on which they could work.

Is prosperity the actual condition of mankind?

Some of the best minds assure us that unemployment and low wages must be perpetual.

Is this because men have lost the use of their hands?

Certainly not; it must be for the other reason, that they have nothing to use their hands upon.

Does the cure of depression require a deep study of political economy?

If it did, the human race would have been extinct before the population reached a thousand.

Does the human race need employers?

If it did, Adam would have died in a poorhouse, if there had been a poorhouse. There was no "capital fund" to pay Adam's wages.

Is the problem of making a living a dreadfully complicated problem?

The problem of working for something to eat should be no more complicated than the problem of eating.

What has complicated the problem of making a living?

The fact that the majority of people are barred

from any right to a place to make a living, and must work for some one else, if possible.

Can a man of ordinary intelligence understand the cause of depression?

Yes, if he can understand this statement: A man who is forbidden to work can not make a living.

Is poverty caused by a scarcity of the good things of life?

The good things are apparently so plentiful that they must be burned or buried.

What causes wholesale poverty while good things are so over-plentiful?

The fact that some men have the privilege of taking, and do take, as much as they wish, leaving very little for the others.

How do people get this power to take?

Through the possession of some special privilege, monopoly; monopoly of gas or water or electricity, monopoly of food or of some branch of industry.

Is there any other way in which people could get the power to take an unfair share?

There is absolutely no other way. Without monopoly, every worker could insist upon, and could secure, a fair share of production, i. e., fair wages.

What is the immediate cause of depression?

Wages are so low that workers can not buy the good things, production must stop, and workers are thrown out of work.

What makes wages low?

The fact that workers must bid for jobs, against unemployed people who must get work or starve.

How does it come about that men are unemployed?

Because government takes the most effective means of barring them from work.

Is there any law on the statute books barring any class of men from the right to work?

No; but the thing is done more effectively by allowing some men the privilege of barring others from work, and of charging without limit for allowing them to work.

---

There is something refreshingly novel in Mr. Foley's presentation. There are those unable to follow the economic reasoning fortifying our contentions, but we are certain they can understand the statement, "They have denied you a place to work. Land is a place to work."

Mr. Foley is a student of the Henry George School and loves economic discussions. But he is confident that the common man can comprehend our teachings without resort to them. He is the author of articles which ran serially for nearly forty weeks in *The Gaelic American* outlining his position.

The new students of our movement are bringing to us some unfamiliar concepts that are new in our philosophy. Charles H. Johnson, a convert of Henry George Atkinson and a student of the Henry George School under the beloved Oscar H. Geiger, gives us this: "Men are all agreed that air, sunlight and water are not property. Then why not land as well, since without air, sun and water land is of no use and therefore of no value? Is it not a little curious that we regard as private property something which has no value save as it is created or enhanced by what we are agreed is *not* property?" Is not this thought worth remembering?—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

How is this accomplished?

By allowing individuals the right to control land.

What does the private ownership of land now include?

It includes the right to control the labor and the lives of those who do not own land, and to appropriate their earnings with absolutely no legal limit.

Why is this plan more effective than a law forbidding men to work?

Because men might evade a law and go to work but they can not evade a man who can make money by charging them for a place to work.

Could not government force wages up in spite of the private control of land?

The law of supply and demand is a natural law, as resistless as the law of gravitation. A stone dropped from a ballon will fall to the ground, and fifteen million men with no place to work will depress wages, in spite of any government regulations. A government which supplies an unlimited amount of helpless labor to the demands of employers must expect unemployment and low wages.

What does the present land system do to the labor market?

It constitutes a most effective "dumping" of the labor of the nation.

Has any government ever succeeded in regulating wages?

Not unless it first abolished every trace of liberty, as in ancient Peru and in modern Russia. Of course, any slave owner can divide his wealth among his slaves as he sees fit, and any nation which abolishes liberty can, and must, regulate production, and dictate the distribution.

Would not business and industry become oppressive in a democracy without government planning and regulation?

If men were given access to the earth and its raw materials, and protected from monopolies, they could, and would, refuse to be exploited. Industry would be restricted to bidding for workers to keep the industries going.

What is it necessary for government to do to prevent oppression and unemployment?

Only these two things:

1. The negative duty of leaving men free to work.
2. The positive duty of preventing any one from interfering with the equal freedom of every man.

Could not the poor still be oppressed by the rich if all were free to use the land on equal terms?

A million men with a billion dollars each could not oppress the poorest man on earth if that man were free to make his own living, by having access to the earth and its raw materials. The president of all the holding companies could no more oppress a western farmer or a city merchant than he could keep the arctic fox from making a living.

How can the farmer or the merchant be exploited at present?

When land monopoly bars him from the land he



looks for work, and the employer allows him to bid for a job against a million other people similarly situated.

Is it only farm workers who suffer from this oppression?

It applies equally to every one who lives by service. The president of Schulte Retail Stores Corporation denies that the reason for closing four of its stores in New Orleans was restrictive legislation. He says: "The reason for closing the stores was that the rents were more than we could pay." The clerks, and perhaps some of the stockholders, may now look for jobs and help to bid wages down.

Which is the most flagrant of all the monopolies?

The private ownership and control of land.

Why is this the worst of all the monopolies?

1. Because it bars the people from work by denying them a place to work, and leaving them to "look for jobs."

2. Because it "dumps" the labor of the people who are able to find work, by forcing them to bid against other people who must either underbid the workers or starve.

3. Because it furnishes all the other monopolies with a world of helpless human material on which to operate.

Could not other monopolies oppress the people even if the land monopoly were destroyed?

They might temporarily exact unfair prices for their products, but they could not keep people out of work, nor hire workers for unfair wages.

What else would limit the exactions of monopolies?

If people had access to the land they could get their own necessities. Other products, such as manufactures, they could do without until prices came down to a fair level.

Should the government disregard other monopolies?

Government should end all monopolies. But the abolition of land monopoly would remove most of the power for mischief which other monopolies now possess.

Is depression caused by the fact that some people have too much wealth?

Wealth in itself is powerless to oppress anybody.

What is the connection between great wealth and depressions?

Depressions are caused not by great wealth, but by control of opportunities. This control causes swollen fortunes, which give rise to further monopolies, resulting in more swollen fortunes, ad infinitum; a perfect vicious circle.

Could depression be cured by dividing the wealth equally?

No. If every man were plentifully supplied with money the monopolists would raise their prices and the land owners would raise their rents. The swollen fortunes and the bread lines would be restored without delay.

Who are the best propagandists for communism?

The landowners and other monopolists.

Why are these more effective as propagandists than the Third International?

Because they are demonstrating to the unemployed and to the underpaid that there is no way in which they can make a living except by dividing the wealth.

How does communism propose to bring Utopia?

By doing away with all private property.

Is there any sound reason for abolishing private property?

If private control of opportunities were ended every one could make as good a living as he cared to work for, and there would be no one rash enough to suggest that the workers divide with the drones.

Who should be the most ardent advocates of equal opportunities for all, and equal access to the land?

The wealthy, who have the most to lose by the threatened abolition of all private property.

What is communism?

Rule by the working classes.

Is it really?

No. Only in theory. In practice it is an absolute dictatorship.

What developed communism?

The well-verified conviction by the workers that there was no way in which they could secure justice except by seizing the power of the state.

Were they correct in this conviction?

No. They could have secured justice and prosperity by voting for freedom of opportunity, and the rights of all to a place to work.

What is fascism?

Fascism is rule by the upper classes.

How did fascism arise?

When Italy, e.g., saw the terrible effects of rule by the socialists in Russia, she decided to forestall its spread by placing all power in the hands of the upper classes, and keeping the working classes permanently helpless.

Which of the two forms of government, communism or fascism, is more desirable?

Both are complete and practicable working forms of tyranny, one disguised, and the other unashamed. "A plague on both your houses."

What is the American form of government?

It is rule by all the citizens, each one as free and as powerful as any other.

Is the American plan workable?

It is workable so long as men are really free. A permanent democracy is impossible where workers are helpless to work without the consent of employers.

What is the greatest danger to the freedom of a free people?

The greatest danger is a lack of freedom. "The cure for the troubles of democracy is more democracy."

Please explain this more fully.

In a free country where people have no right to work for a living, living conditions become unbearable. The victims attribute this to the form of government, and democracy is swept away in a flood of communism or fascism.

Are these your conclusions?

No. This is only modern European history.

What is the greatest objection to communism?

It must begin with the complete destruction of liberty.

What is necessary to end unemployment and low wages, without communism?

Absolutely nothing except liberty, including the right to a place to make a living, and to the raw materials of the earth.

Is there any hope of ending wholesale poverty while land monopoly persists?

It is as hopeless as to expect that a man will become wealthy while other people are allowed to take his earnings without limit.

Could not prosperity be assured by the control of other monopolies without interfering with the land system?

If other reforms could put every man to work at high wages, "land values" would rise by the exact amount of the increase. In other words, the landowners would pocket the entire increase.

Why is not private control of land universally recognized as a monopoly?

Because the ownership of land is so widespread that even some poor people own land.

Does not this widespread ownership take land out of the monopoly class?

To the fifteen million Americans who have no work, and no right to a place to work, it makes no difference whether the ownership of the land is in one man or a million men.

Can it be possible that landowners are victims of the land system?

They are, by thousands. Every landowner who must work for a living is a victim of the depression, either in low wages or in unemployment. A deed to a house or farm is no cure for a depression.

Is it ownership of land that causes unemployment?

No. Unemployment and low wages are caused by *control* of land, with the privilege of barring others from access to the earth.

Is control of land necessary to encourage industry and thrift?

No. To encourage industry and thrift it is only necessary that men have security in the possession of land.

How could government give men security in the possession of land, and at the same time prevent this harmful control of land?

By government making a reality of the law of eminent domain, and taking the rental value of the land as a consideration, the same as any other proprietor does.

Could not the people in possession of land still control land and force unemployment if government took the rental value of its land?

No. The landowner now forces unemployment by holding the land idle until a satisfactory tribute has been paid. He could not afford to hold land idle if he had to pay the annual value to the government. Idle land would be thrown on the market, the price of all land would fall, and the unemployed could use it to make a living.

Is the system of private land control as vicious as the old system of slavery?

The right to force people into unemployment and starvation is just as vicious as any system of individual slavery, and by so much more mischievous as it is disguised.

Would the removal of land monopoly inevitably bring prosperity?

Giving men the right to work, and a place to work would cure unemployment and low wages as obviously as the giving of food would cure starvation.

Will you describe the steps by which equal access to the land would bring prosperity?

To describe all the good effects of letting men work, and letting them keep the fruits of their work, would require a volume larger than an unabridged dictionary. It would take longer than to tell the things a starving nation could do if they were fed.

Will you give an outline of the effects of government collecting all the rent of land?

Yes, but I must restrict it to a few of the effects of freedom, including only those effects so obvious that they are beyond dispute, and rigidly excluding any flights of fancy.

1. If the holders of idle land continued to hold it idle they would pay the full yearly value to the state, thus largely relieving other citizens of the payment of taxes. Of course no landowners would continue to hold land idle. They would put it into production, or surrender it.

2. If they surrendered it, the now unemployed could use it to make a living; farm land to grow food, or city land to start a business.

3. If the owners put the land into production they would have to employ men.

4. Bearing in mind that the annual rental value of land is collected by the government, the land would not be free, but the speculative values would be squeezed out, the lowest grade of land now in use would have no rental value, and all other land would be cheapened in proportion.

5. Every piece of land put into production would require building, giving rise to employment, and solving the unemployment problem.

6. If any unemployed were left, (which would be very unlikely), they would have an abundance

of good land on which to make a living, free of taxes, or with only nominal taxes.

7. The above results would be cumulative. Every parcel put into production would give employment to builders. Men put to work would buy food, clothing and shelter, speeding up business in all directions.

8. The chaotic tax system, now running wild, would be wiped out, and the values produced by land would pay all the taxes, and every man's earnings would be left to him in their entirety.

9. The bureaucracies now smothering the American people, with their mountains of taxes, would be done away with. People free to make their living would need no bureaus.

Why have all the efforts of reformers to abolish poverty gone for nothing?

Because each one has concentrated on some symptom instead of looking to causes. Their scattered efforts have nullified each other, while the monopolists have gathered in the spoils.

How do these efforts work out in practice?

The ineffectual cries for myriads of reforms, many of them contradictory, have about convinced the nations that reform is an impossible dream, that political economy is the dismal science, and that the poor must be always with us.

Will not these multiplied efforts of reformers finally abolish poverty?

The same kind of efforts, continued during the next thousand years, will see the same results, accelerating unemployment and poverty.

Is there any disagreement among the monopolists?

The monopolists have been able to work together with a harmony that would put the early Christians to shame. They have a common meeting ground, a common denominator, to which everything else must defer, and which coordinates all their activities.

What is the common denominator of the exploiters?

That a helpless people, barred from any right to work for themselves, shall be at the mercy of the exploiters.

Do the exploiters never quarrel among themselves?

Oh yes; but only over the division of the spoils. It would be unwise for a pirate band to quarrel before the ship has been looted.

Could people interested in abolishing poverty find a common denominator?

They could find a common meeting ground in fighting for liberty, the equal rights of all men to the use of the earth on equal terms.

Would any reformer have to abandon his pet reform by adopting this common denominator?

He might be able to introduce his favorite reform, if it is a genuine reform, when men are once free to work. It is a hopeless job to introduce any

reform in a country where men have no right to work, and where fifteen million men can not even find work at low wages. Men on a bread line want work, not lectures on economics or politics.

Could Jews and Christians concentrate on this plan?

Every real religion is based on belief in the brotherhood of men. A Jew or a Christian who believes in shutting out his brother from a chance to work is below the pagan in morality.

Could communists join in this policy?

If a man desires to divide up the wealth of the world, it would certainly seem logical for him to begin by giving all men equal rights in the earth.

Could government planners unite on freedom of the land?

Government planning might get somewhere after men have been given the right to work, and have gone to work. Government plans to bring prosperity to men forbidden to work are more Utopian than Utopia.

How about the battlers for good government?

Governments were instituted among men to promote life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness. Liberty to make a living was not specifically excepted. The word "government" applied to a system which bars its people from the right to work is poetic license.

How about the patriots fighting for the liberties of their conquered homelands?

If land monopoly were abolished the conquering heroes would find their occupation gone. The first aim of the conqueror is to monopolize the land, not for the conquering nation, but for the war lords. The first doctrine of patriots throughout the world should be that the land of a nation belongs to the people of that nation.

Moreover, political freedom without economic freedom, without the right to make a living, is an empty formula. The domestic exploiter can be just as merciless and grinding as the foreign war lord.

Should welfare workers work for the right of the people to the land?

It would be a heartless thing to say that all the charity work is love's labor lost; but the millions of dollars donated by private persons, the millions collected by the St. Vincent de Paul Societies and the Salvation Army, from people who can ill afford them, and the billions expended for relief by the United States Government, all these find their way to the strong boxes of the exploiters as inevitably as the rain on the mountain top finally comes to rest in the ocean.

The exploiters have been given power to take, and there is no magic to keep from them the millions collected for charity. The result of land monopoly is to leave the people as a maximum, the bare cost of living, and the exploiter automatically

subtracts that amount from the wages that must otherwise be paid.

If men were once more free to work, the labors of the charitable societies could be concentrated on the widows, the orphans, and the helpless, and the job could be done thoroughly and handsomely. They are now engaged in filling a bottomless pit.

Why have all the efforts of government and of philanthropists failed to bring prosperity?

Because they are engaged in an undertaking which is physically impossible. Public prosperity and private control of land are a contradiction in terms. Nothing can ever make men prosperous while their earnings may be taken in advance and without limit for a permit to work.

Is there any mystery connected with depression?

Yes. The mystery of why fifteen million men who are barred from work are out of work; and the mystery of why workers who must bid against these fifteen million unemployed find their wages low; and the mystery of why the American people have not recognized the vicious land system as the inevitable cause of the depression.

Would it be a serious matter to abolish the private control of land?

Yes; but it will be a more serious matter to continue unemployment and poverty and depression until the end of the world. And communism is rather a serious matter.

## Reformers, Respectability and Officitis

MOSES did not choose to be respectable. Had he done so, the greatest reform movement in history would never have happened. He might have advocated some ameliorating measures for Jewish slaves, such as shorter hours, or better housing conditions, or maybe even a minimum wage. In advocating such things he could have maintained a comfortable place among the ruling group, of which he was a member, he would not have violently offended the Pharaohs, and thus would have retained his personal comfort and importance. Perhaps he might have made the condition of his co-religionists somewhat less repulsive. But they would still be slaves. Their degraded position would in time have weakened their resistance to the idolatry of the Egyptian religion. Indeed, during the Exodus it was the degenerating influence of their past environment that caused him so much concern, and it was only because of his genius as a leader and moulder of opinion that he was able to overcome this influence. Several generations of slavery produce a people that is akin to a domesticated animal—entirely subservient to a master. Realizing the growing decadence of his people

Moses did not propose any change that would ease their thralldom; he chose the difficult course of revolt, with a consequent loss of respectability.

Respectability in a reformer consists in attempting to slightly alter the condition of the people without depriving the predatory group of their vested interests. Their slaves were the vested interests of the Egyptian landlords. The latter might have tolerated some humane suggestion for easing the condition of their slaves, provided the institution of slavery were not abolished. In our time, we find the House of Representatives advocating old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, community chests, collective bargaining—"social improvements" of one kind or another that do not in the slightest affect their vested interests and monopoly privileges. Such political reformers as Roosevelt and Tugwell and Ickes et al are quite within the sphere of respectability in advocating these innocuous measures. They do not risk their social or political prestige by advocating the application of a salve to the sore-covered hide of the slave, provided they do not threaten the institution. Social ostracism is visited only on those who attempt real reforms—that is, reforms that aim to deprive the privileged class of their privileges. Moses was determined to free the Jews, and therefore he lost caste with the Pharaohs. The Roosevelts of our day have no intention of breaking with our Pharaohs; they are respectable.

Jesus was not crucified because of his ethical teachings. His martyrdom (unless we accept the theory of vicarious atonement) was the direct result of his attack on the vested interests of the Jewish priests. Had he let them continue their money-changing in the temple unmolested, he might have continued without interference the performance of miracles and the teachings of the "other cheek" philosophy. But Jesus realized that the spiritual degradation of the Jews, and the consequent loss of their political independence, was the direct result of their poverty, and that this was caused by the selfishness of their rulers. A true reformer does not deal with effects; he seeks to eradicate causes. In doing so, if he is really a great man, he is influenced neither by the interests he attacks nor the consequences upon himself. Jesus' unrespectability cost him his life. He did not lay the blame for the priests' wrong-doing upon a "system;" he did not condone their greed on the ground that the laws of the land permitted it. He did not try to change the laws. He accused the priests of personal guilt. Sin is always personal; there is no institutional sin. If the law permits me to deprive other people of their property, that fact does not exonerate me from the crime of robbery. Society simply is too stupid to recognize the crime and to visit punishment upon me. The great reformer aims to show society that my acts are in fact criminal; having done so, restrictive and retributive regulations follow. Jesus' attacks upon the priests

was personal. He was unrespectable, and therefore effective.

The great reformers of all times were those who attacked personally the beneficiaries of an iniquity. When a reform movement ceases to attack, when it seeks to make changes surreptitiously so as not to shock sensibilities, when it attempts to provide soft couches for those it aims to knock down, when it tries to coddle harlots into virtuous living, when it woos the interests it aims to destroy and accepts their bribes, then that reform is doomed. The success of the socialist movement—a success that must be measured by the general acceptance of its impossible philosophy, even by those who cling to the hope that by some magic of words Marxism and individual freedom can be reconciled—is due to the fact that it has never ceased to attack the predatory interests. In the sense that it will rectify social and economic maladjustment socialism can never succeed. It is a false philosophy. But in spite of the falseness of their philosophy, socialists have been eminently successful in having it tried, even in our country where the traditions of individualism were thought to be of the people. Why? Because socialists never were respectable. They always attacked, viciously, relentlessly, even fanatically.

The failure of the Henry George movement—a failure that is attested not only by the paucity of the number of its adherents, but more because every political measure that is advanced throughout the world aims to entrench the system of private land ownership, showing that Henry George's teachings are of no influence whatsoever—the failure of this movement to gain headway is due solely to its proneness for respectability. We cannot escape this conclusion, unless we accept the position that the philosophy itself is lacking in truth, a position which even the opponents of the Single Tax do not altogether take. The very nicety of Henry George's logic has been the means taken by those who professed to believe it—if the movement has had leaders, who were they?—to soften its attack on the privilege it aims to destroy.

Henry George himself was a courageous reformer. His proposal is a deadly attack on the most vicious and most powerful vested interest the world has ever known—the private ownership of the earth. Never did he soften this attack, never did he fail to point out that those who own the land own those who live on it. He compared land owners to slave owners. He accused land speculators of causing hard times. The polish of his phrases and the perfection of his logic only accentuated the viciousness of his attack. In the presentation of his revolutionary idea, either in printed word or on the platform, he did not compromise, nor did he hold any hope for those whose privilege he aimed to destroy, or suggest any method for easing their pain. He was

unscrupulously attacked by the land owners, he was even jailed. He was not respectable.

But George was greater as a reformer than as a leader. He seemed to have lacked political vision. His understanding of human frailties, it is now evident, was as deficient as his grasp of economic truths was great. For, when he deliberately led his followers into the Democratic Party (that was, and is, as much a bulwark of privilege as is the Republican Party) because Cleveland said something about reducing tariffs, he injected into the Single Tax movement a poison that for fifty years has sapped its energy and reduced it to its present state of innocuous desuetude. That poison is *Officitis*—that which there is no seductive siren, whiskey nor narcotic more weakening to the moral fibre of a reformer.

Every great writer, who is at all prolific, has produced something which is mediocre. But George did more than that in one chapter of one of his great books. He laid the ground work for the very disintegration of the movement in the chapter entitled "Practical Politics" in "Protection or Free Trade." The illogic of that chapter would induce one to believe it an interpolation were not the style truly Georgean. His argument throughout the book is that international free trade can have no beneficial bearing on economic or social conditions unless we have free trade among individuals, and he points out that free trade England did not remove poverty there because of this inadequacy. And then, in this chapter, he argues that Single Taxers should join the Democratic Party (which, he must have known, was financed by the landed aristocracy) because it professed a desire to lower tariffs—"as an entering wedge." Surely some evil genius—or was it some politically minded friend?—must have directed his pen in the writing of this chapter.

The joining of forces with a political party that is supported by privilege was (unwittingly on George's part) a concession to respectability—and when a reformer makes that concession his cause is doomed. The first concession is the prelude to others, and the progressive dilution of a great truth makes it akin to a falsehood. Had George been followed by a Moses or a Jesus the evil results of his tactical error would have been averted. Unfortunately, no such dynamic personality has as yet taken up his cause. There have been a number of brilliant orators and teachers of his gospel, the most prominent and capable of whom were more influenced by the erroneous method he suggested (we know it was erroneous) than by his own honesty and singleness of purpose. Not that these men were not wholehearted in their advocacy of the Single Tax. But Henry George's first concession in principle—that is, the possible adoption of free trade as a means toward the goal of economic liberty—made possible further concessions on the part of his followers. In proposing such things as the "Single

Tax Limited," (which is Single Tax only by devious reasoning), in spending so much effort toward securing initiative and referendum laws, in devising sly measures for shifting the tax burden—"sly" because the obvious idea was to avert the accusation that such measures might tend toward the breaking up of land monopoly—these men were unconsciously influenced by George's political mistake rather than by George's uncompromising philosophy. So much so that some so-called stalwart Single Taxers—they would themselves lay claim to being so-called—have been advocates of such incongruities as income taxes and inheritance taxes, NRA and government ownership. The process of seeking respectability has become so complete as to remove all taint of being reformers.

But more vicious than the vitiating of the singleness of his proposal by this concession was his weakening of the morale of his most accomplished disciples by making politicians of them. It is an axiom that politicians prefer office to principle. A statesman (in theory at least) will go down with his policies, but a politician will abandon an entire platform if need be to retain his position. The thought that Single Taxers in office, elected on a platform that is diametrically opposed to the Single Tax, or appointed to office by those elected on such platform, might do more for the advancement of the philosophy than can the independent reformer is quite erroneous. It is, in fact, dishonest to expect them to do so. The party in power is there because it has promised the people to do certain things; to do other things, like enacting the Single Tax, which it did not promise, is to violate a sacred trust. Every member of the party, no matter how insignificant the post he holds, is in duty bound to carry out its political promises; he is a traitor to this trust who advocates anything else. Most likely every Georgist who has held office has harbored the hope that he might sometime induce his party to write the Single Tax into its platform. A sort of "boring from within" plan. This is an obvious impossibility, since both of the dominant parties in this country are controlled by privilege through the vital nerve centers of their campaign funds. Besides, it is ridiculous to expect a political party to adopt a principle for which there is no public clamor. When, therefore, the Single Taxer achieves public office and discovers that his advocacy of this fundamental reform is at variance with the policies of his party, and may militate against his continuing on the public payroll, he finds it more politic to subdue his reforming proclivities. This is not dishonesty of purpose; it is that pardonable human frailty—*Officitis*. The office overcomes the man. That is why the very able disciples of Henry George who followed his suggestion of joining the Cleveland Democracy accomplished nothing toward the advancement of the Single Tax, not even to the extent of increasing a knowledge of the philosophy. As office holders they became Democrats first and Single Taxers

thereafter. This is not said in a spirit of rancor or even criticism, for this metamorphosis of the reformer to respectability is, in a politician, as easy as it is inevitable. As a matter of fact the prominent Georgists who became Democratic office holders did damage to the advancement of the cause; for their silence in high places, and their circumspection in all places, caused their less fortunate and adulating co-believers to also subdue their demand for a liberated earth to the mere whisper for a shift in taxes, so that the ordinary citizen, who may have listened to these erstwhile preachers in pre-office days, ceased to take interest in this great truth now diluted. Jehovah must always be omnipotent; when his high priests explain and modify Him he is no longer Jehovah.

Time, the great healer, is gradually undoing the damage done to his cause by George's tactical error. Because of its fundamental truth and its greatness of purpose his philosophy has survived; also because throughout the years a few bold ones persisted in preaching it in all the purity of its promise. Had these few honest souls been aided by those whose Single Tax beliefs were submerged by their political affiliations—and these were, on the whole, of greater abilities—perhaps the great truth would by this time have achieved wide public acceptance. But time has removed most of those who claimed the mantle of George. The hope of the movement is in a new generation who will pursue their own methods and tactics, uninfluenced by the errors of the past. To them the disputes between the purists and the respectables will be unknown. They will get their knowledge from the inspired pages of "Progress and Poverty"—where the truth is revealed in all its purity—and not from the modifiers, whose words are even now almost forgotten. And sometime, somewhere, from among these disciples will arise a Moses who, thoroughly unrespectable and immune to the disease of *Officitis*, will demand in a voice loud enough to be heard complete freedom from slavery; whose genius for leadership will make possible the era of human progress promised by Henry George. And he will probably be crucified.

FRANK CHODOROV.

## Land Value and Its Taxation

By HENRY L. T. TIDEMAN

THE challenge of Frank Stephens, based I presume on the basis of his enclavial experience, on the impossibility of making effective effort to take ground rent into the public treasuries, calls for an answer.

How often the question has been asked: How can you levy taxation upon land values when the Single Tax will have destroyed land values? And how often it has been answered! But, once again this question arises from, and is itself involved in a too free use of words. If anyone believes that the taxation of land values will "destroy" the selling price of land, he should take time

out to study the matter. The word "destroy" has a definite meaning. It does not belong in the question. The Single Tax will not destroy the selling price of land capable of producing ground rent. The only lands the selling price of which will be destroyed will be the body of lands that will constitute the new margin of cultivation when land speculation is made unprofitable.

That the taxation of land values by the Single Tax method will reduce the selling value of lands is not in dispute. That the Single Tax will destroy land values except as they are fictitious, is nonsense.

Let us look at the detail of the extreme application of the Single Tax. Assuming that the current rate of interest on investments is six per cent, and taking the instance of a piece of land the ground rent of which is \$1,060. Let us assume that the tax levy requires a tax of \$1,000 to be paid.

We have

Ground Rent - - - - -	\$1,060
Tax - - - - -	\$1,000
<hr/>	
Net ground rent remaining - - - -	\$ 60
Value of land paying \$60 net to its holder is	\$1,000
Tax rate, then is (1,000/1,000) - - -	100%

Such a lot in Chicago at the present time and under the present taxing system will pay:

Ground Rent - - - - -	\$1,060
Tax - - - - -	\$ 265
<hr/>	
Net ground rent remaining - - - -	\$ 795
Value of land paying \$795 net to its holder is	\$13,250
Chicago's tax rate at present is - - -	2%

Now, as a practical matter, do the assessing officials dig into private affairs to discover the ground rent received by this landholder? Of course not. They make an appraisal, as best they can, of the selling value of the land, and put it on their books. That is all that will be necessary under the most extreme application of the Single Tax.

The nicety of perfection not attainable in the construction of machinery, in art and in the control of physical forces, in all of which activities we think in terms of our ability to control the details of process and structure, should not be expected to result from even the wisest adjustment of human institutions to the need of men who wish to be free.

Even under the influence of the Single Tax, small leaks of economic rent into the purses of landholders and their lessees will occur. What of it? Under a condition that prevents land speculation and monopoly, and when most folks will be landholders, and all others free to become so, small inequalities will be of such little consequence that they may best be left as matters of conscience.

Now for a few moments on the subject of interest. The controlling law here is that "men seek to satisfy

their desires with the least possible exertion." All borrowing is voluntary, as is lending.

In production, time is an element. It cannot be avoided. When present possession of products useful to production gives advantage over future possession, if that advantage is sufficiently great, a borrower enters the market. Both the borrower and the lender operate under the law of least exertion. Sometimes the borrower "rents" a building or other product, directly from its owner, sometimes indirectly through a banker.

As the result of my useful work, I have possession of a thousand dollars. This means to me, and it is a fact, that all of the varieties of products in the market, \$1,000 worth of them belongs to me. I lend my \$1,000 to a borrower. I may believe, and the borrower also, that I am lending him the \$1,000. I am not. I am permitting him to use products belonging to me that are still in the market because I have not claimed them.

When men go through the forms of borrowing to secure the use or possession of land, a different problem arises, but it has no relation to the subject of interest. And it is in this field of study where confusion on the subject of interest arises.

## The Only Permanent Cure For Unemployment

By J. C. LINCOLN

EVERY community, by its presence and activity, creates a fund which is the natural source from which its expenses should be drawn. This fund is ground rent. For instance, there is a little candy store on Euclid Avenue, in Cleveland that rents, I am told, for \$2,000 per year, per foot. It is very clear that this \$2,000 per year, per foot, is a community product which is appropriated by the owner of the fee to the property. It is further clear that this \$2,000 per year, per foot, produced by the community and appropriated by the fee owner, defrauds the community by just this amount. Our present land laws make it legal for fee owners to defraud the community by appropriating the community-created ground rent to the extent of twelve or thirteen billion dollars per year in the United States. This fund is ample to take care of reasonable governmental expense.

A little thought will make it clear that the selling value of land is the ground rent, actual or expected, capitalized and the amount of this ground rent in such a city as New York is partially appreciated when it is realized that the privilege granted to the fee owner to appropriate the community-created ground rent is, in places worth \$400,000 per foot front. It is clear that the provisions of our law which make it legal for fee owners to appropriate such enormous sums of money, which they do not earn, but which are created by the activities of the community, are unethical, unscientific and should be changed. One hundred years ago it was *legal* to hold slaves, but

most of us are convinced that it was never *right* to hold slaves. Our laws should be altered so as to make it impossible for individuals to appropriate the enormous amounts of community created ground rent, which it is now legal for them to do.

#### THE EFFECT ON UNEMPLOYMENT OF HAVING THE COMMUNITY COLLECT ITS OWN GROUND RENT

It might as well, at this point, to get clearly in mind that wealth-producing employment is simply the *application of labor to land or the products of land*. It is very clear that employment in raising wheat, or cotton, or cattle, or dairy products, is the direct application of labor to land. Employment in manufacturing of automobiles, ginning of cotton, or milling of flour consists in modifying the products of land into more useful forms. Employment on the railroads, and bus lines, express offices and post offices is increasing the value of these products of land by transporting them from one place to another.

Is it not clear that if *all land* was held out of use that all wealth producing employment would cease?

If all land was held out of use, there would be no employment in raising the food we eat, or mining the coal we burn, or in building and keeping up the roads we travel on, or in building and keeping up the houses we live in.

If all land was held out of use, life on this planet would cease.

It is clear then that if any land is held out of use, employment is to just that extent decreased. Our present land laws make it pay to buy land for speculative purposes and hold it out of use, or out of its best use, until it can be sold at a profit. The writer lives, during the summer, in Aurora, a suburb of Cleveland, and near his home are many thousands of acres which are held out of use in this way. In Arizona, where this is being written, I would say that fully half of the land within ten miles of Phoenix is held out of use until it can be sold.

Is it not clear that a large part of the load of bonds under which our municipalities are staggering, are bonds for paving, and sewers, and water lines in front of miles of vacant lots? These improvements were put in to help sell land.

If it had not been for land speculation such of these improvements as were not needed would not have been made and millions of dollars worth of bonds issued for improvements the community did not need and which may be defaulted would not be a burden on the tax payer today.

At the present time the actions of our governing authorities are based on the assumption that the use of *capital* makes employment and consequently the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is making huge loans, for the purpose of increasing employment. A moment's thought will make it apparent that *land* or its products are the only essentials to employment. The use of capital renders this employment more productive than it otherwise would be.

The pioneers who spread over our country from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific during the century that ended about 1875 had no lack of employment, but they did almost entirely lack capital.

#### WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO LAND VALUE IF THE COMMUNITY COLLECTED THE GROUND RENT CREATED BY ITS PRESENCE AND ACTIVITY?

Since land values are simply ground rent capitalized, it is clear that if the community collected its ground rent, the selling value of land would go practically to zero. If this occurred it would be unprofitable to hold land out of use. Consequently it would be thrown on the market and be bought at an extremely low cost. Such a change as this would entirely prevent land speculation but in no way interfere with the productive use of land. At the present time ground rent goes into the pocket of the individual. Under the proposed scheme the amount would be paid to the community in the shape of taxes. The use value of land would be the same in either case.

#### COMMUNITY HAS NO RIGHT TO TAKE INDIVIDUALLY CREATED WEALTH

If the above proposed scheme were adopted and the community took the ground rent created by its presence and activity for community expenses, it would be unnecessary to levy taxes on individually created wealth as it does at the present time. Last winter the writer lived in a house in the middle of an orange grove, in Phoenix, Arizona. You will all agree that he has no right to take the fruit from this orange grove without paying the owner for it. The community, however, takes the position that it has a right to take a considerable part of the product of this orange grove in the shape of taxes every year. If there are 50,000 people in Phoenix, and the taxes on this orange grove equal the value of 50,000 oranges, it is equivalent to saying that each individual has a right to take one orange from this grove without paying for it. Most of us are convinced that the government of Russia is doing an unjust thing in taking from the peasants of Russia such a large amount of the crops as they do. But is it not clear that our tax system does exactly the same thing, but possibly not to the same degree? To put it rather bluntly, our laws permit the fee holders to steal about twelve or thirteen billion dollars per year of ground rent created by the presence and activity of the community. Then the community steals from the individual an almost equal amount to pay the expenses of our federal, state and local governments. Is it not clear that we do not suffer from lack of land in this country to give everyone employment? What we suffer from is the fact that this unused land is held at such a high price that the ordinary person is unable to obtain any of it to use.

The number of jobs which would be created if twenty-five per cent of the unused land in the United States were put into use would largely relieve our present unemployment situation. If all of it was put to use there would be



more jobs than there are people to fill them and unemployment would be a thing of the past. Under a system in which there were more jobs than there were workers, wages would rise to a point where they practically equalled the value of the product, thereby obtaining a just distribution of wealth which must be obtained if our civilization is to last. The foolishness of our taxation laws is apparent when we realize that a man who builds a building, thereby furnishing employment for hundreds of people in its construction and for many people in its operation, is fined by the community in the shape of increased taxes. At the present time this tax item is great enough to very considerably decrease the number of buildings which would otherwise be erected. At the same time we allow a person to hold title to coal lands, for instance, for thirty or forty years until the owner can find somebody who will pay him his price for it, rather than levying taxes against this land so that it will have to be worked or sold to somebody who will work it. It is land that is being worked that makes employment, not the land which is being held unworked until the owner can get the price which suits him.

At present if a man starts a factory and gives employment to hundreds of people, he is fined in the shape of taxes on his *building*, taxes on his *machinery*, taxes on his *inventory*, and in those states that have sales taxes, in taxes on his *sales*.

Our tax laws would make one think that it was a crime to add to wealth of the community or to increase employment and that it was a *praiseworthy* thing to *decrease* employment by holding land out of use for speculative purposes.

We must realize that *land is provided* by the Creator and that all His children have an *equal right* to a life use of an *equal share*. We must realize that *wealth* is the product of an *individual* or of *groups of individuals* and that while the community does have the *power* to appropriate part of this wealth it has no *right* to do so.

We must realize that society can be healthy only if it *obeys* the moral law, "Thou Shalt Not Steal"—and that getting something for nothing is the *essence of stealing*. If society permits *land values to arise* by allowing fee owners to appropriate community-created ground rent, it must pay the penalty in *unemployment* and *low wages*, caused by holding *vast* areas of land out of use or out of its best use. If society discourages thrift and *individual initiative* and business activity by appropriating part of the value created by the individual in the shape of taxes on wealth, it must pay the penalty in the decreased employment and consequent lower wages resulting from lessened business activity. Until we act on the very obvious truth that what the community produces should be collected by and for the community and not by and for fee owners, and also recognize that what the individual produces is his and the community has no right to it, we shall be plagued with *unemployment and Communism*.

Very little change in our laws would be required to ob-

tain the results desired. We are already taking part of the community-created ground rent in the shape of taxes on land value; all that would be necessary would be to take the rest of the ground rent and abolish all taxation on wealth.

## Ways and Means

ADDRESS OF ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE AT  
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

**M**OST of our conferences during the past few years have been talk-fests, that undoubtedly warmed and inspired all of us who attended them, but did not send us forth with a definite concerted plan for work.

I hope certainly that this Congress is going to be a love feast, but I hope also that it is going to result in the most focussed effort that was ever achieved by a gathering of Single Taxers.

We must not go away from here regretful that we had wasted money that might better have been used on real propaganda.

The dollars we are spending in getting together at this place and time are hard earned and must be *well spent!*

For my own part I feel breathless with responsibility and the consciousness that *tempus is fugiting*. Unless we move quickly and really accomplish something that will count in world affairs, we will be too late; our opportunity will have been missed and our cause (snowed under stupid palatives), will slip back into the limbo of lost causes, for sad, long years.

Times are desperate and it is vital that we, who have the key to the situation, pool our ideas; that we find, as I implored last year, the "greatest common demonination"—one central plan on which we can all agree—on which we can focus our endeavors.

This does not imply that we must not, in our several ways, work also to meet our special or local needs; it merely means that united we must stand.

We must organize.

Single Taxers must become known to Single Taxers—all over the map. Single Taxers en masse, must make themselves known as Single Taxers to the world at large.

It should of necessity be an organization that has one common purpose—one purpose for which we can all work.

Education is our greatest ally. We need more people who understand our philosophy.

Ignorance is our enemy. It has long been our boast that (unless he be a gainer through the special privilege that is the order of this present system) no one can be against us if he really understands our doctrine.

Therefore, our paramount effort should be directed toward widespread education in our philosophy.

We can certainly all stand together on that platform; no matter how we may disagree as to political interpre-

tation, we must certainly agree that the preaching of our philosophy, as taught in "Progress and Poverty," is our first great duty.

Therefore I pray we may form a fellowship that shall reach far and wide, across the borders of this land, across the oceans—and be the means of banding Single Taxers into a great army.

The work that has been, and is being done, by the Henry George School of Social Science is one of the most inspiring and deep reaching manifestations of progress in our cause for many a year.

This School, long the dream and then the realization of Oscar Geiger, is a monument dedicated to his life. He put his last strength into it and before he died started something that if it is continued, promises to carry us to victory.

Under his guidance the straight and unadulterated Georgan economics and philosophy were taught and students were graduated who are going out to carry on the fight, with practically the same keen mental grasp of the subject and almost the same spiritual fervor that those first disciples had, who learned directly from the lips of Henry George himself.

These new converts, who have acquired the Truth at the Henry George School, are the main financial supporters of the School.

It is a fact to give us all heart of grace.

One hundred and fifty are studying at the School now, of whom I am one—and we, who are trustees, are urging that extension branches be started all over the country under the tutelage of old, well-grounded Single Taxers.

It is a work that the faithful all over the land should back—not only with funds to enable it to carry on, but with cooperation of every possible kind.

While I harp on the absolute necessity of carrying on the Henry George School of Social Science, while I harp most fervently on the need for forming an organization that shall knit the Single Taxers together in one great focussed group, dedicated to clear propaganda—a group strong enough and dignified enough to lure back into the fighting ranks those thousands of Single Taxers who have been quiescent for years—I do not, in speaking to the point of Ways and Means—forget for one minute our duty to the great activities already so well established.

LAND AND FREEDOM should be steadily read by ten times as many as read it today and so should Mr. Beckwith's paper *Tax Facts*, and all our other periodicals. This Henry George Foundation should be better supported. All our avenues of propaganda must be retained. Somehow we must find means. When we do dig out the old Single Taxers who have believed our cause was a thing of the past, and when we do lead in the new Single Taxers who are being made through the Henry George School and through the extension courses, we will have a powerful group that should with new enthusiasm support our work.

But meanwhile we must, each in his way, fight more valiantly and more fervently than ever. We must not forget, in the rhythm of our glorious chorus, to continue with all the solo parts. Henry Ware Allen plugging along with those excellent letters that are sent to a group of powerful papers each week, and printed by many of them; the personal letters sent by Teresa Burger, that have been the means of bringing forth most helpful expressions from people in high places; the articles of Frank Wentworth; the street corner talks of George Lloyd and Morris Van Veen; the passing of pamphlets by Mr. Maguire;—the few words on our blessed subject spoken by you or me in trolley or taxi or on railroad train—we never know—some of these sparks may light the great Torch.

I personally am not afraid to use the word Single Tax. It is our trade mark. We cannot loose it—even though we try. The world is becoming used to the once-despised word Communism, and may have to become used to much more terrible words, before the end. Our name has lost its opprobrium and I believe we can fearlessly flaunt it and re-educate the world to its meaning. It is time now to show that the word Single Tax is synonymous with the words "law," "order," "peace," "justice."

There have been sad losses in our ranks since we meet in Conference a year ago.

Fred J. Bahni, whose workmanship many of you are carrying today in your buttonholes and who made for me this bracelet that I so proudly wear; Chester Platt, who used so regularly to attend our Conferences; Stoughton Cooley who bore the banner of his faith as long as he had the strength to lift it; Sir George Fowlds of New Zealand the most courageous of fighters; Oscar H. Geiger who gave his own savings as well as his very life to launch the Henry George School.

And I miss many, who through lack of funds cannot be here today, and three, who through illness cannot be here—Bolton Hall, Mr. Maguire and John Lawrence Monroe, but to those who are here I say—with Tennyson's Ulysses:

"Come, my friend,

Tis not too late to seek a newer world.

Push off, and sitting well in order smite

The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds

To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths

Of all the western stars, until I die.

It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;

It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles. . . ."

FIFTY years ago Henry George pointed out that the increasing number of mortgaged farms indicated that homeowning farmers were being turned into tenants. Politicians and university economists pooh-poohed the idea. "A farm mortgage is an indication of progress and prosperity," they shouted. Well, who has turned out to be right?

## Henry George School of Social Science

THINGS are happening. As we go to press, the capable director of the Henry George School of Social Science, Norman C. B. Fowles, reports so exceedingly an active and varied campaign for the new spring term starting February 4, that this story must be a rather sketchy summary of the details of this campaign. It is characteristic of the director that he is more concerned with the plans for the future than with any record of accomplishments. The fact that nearly one hundred and fifty boys, girls, men and women have during the past four months studied "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade" is not nearly as important as the details of the plan to double this number during the coming term, or the methods proposed for extending the work of the School outside its own portals.

On December 31, a mail circular offering the course in Fundamental Economics and Social Philosophy was mailed to twelve thousand New York City school teachers. Replies to this circular have to be followed up, sometimes two and three times. Letters were mailed to high school principals offering Free Scholarships to capable seniors in their schools. A similar offer was made to heads of the departments of philosophy, sociology, and economics at the local colleges and universities. Also, a number of social service organizations were circularized for the purpose of securing their secretaries as students. A committee of women, under the chairmanship of the ever-willing Mrs. Anna George de Mille, has been at work for over a month rounding up enrollments for afternoon classes, a most difficult time of the day to get people to go to school. The work of writing letters, preparing copy, answering inquiries, following up names of prospective students, interviews, is neither dramatic nor of apparent importance. Yet it is vitally necessary to achieve the goal, that of getting more and more enrollments.

One cannot possibly appreciate without seeing the amount of effort expended in getting people to attend these classes. It must be remembered that a course in the Georgist philosophy can be offered to the prospective student merely for its cultural value. He cannot hope to derive any material benefit from the acquisition of this knowledge, which is the usual motive for attending a school. The pure altruism of our philosophy, and the lack of selfish motive on the part of the School, makes the "selling" of the course most difficult. Mr. Fowles reports that the skepticism of some of the prospective students regarding the School's motives is a real obstacle in securing enrollments. Many of them cannot believe that back of our offer there is no nefarious scheme for separating them from their money. It takes real salesmanship to convince them that we have nothing to sell, save a plan for the betterment of the race.

The greatest result of the School work is the enthusiasm engendered in the students. Practically all of those who attended the fall term submitted names of friends for scholarships in the spring term. Many enrolled for Part II—which is devoted to a study of the "Science of Political Economy" and Professor Geiger's "Philosophy of Henry George"—and quite a few are taking Part I over again. At this writing the Student-Alumni Council is planning a dinner for graduates and present students, as well as for old-timers. The work of knitting together socially those who have acquired a knowledge of Henry George has not been overlooked.

The Extension Courses being organized throughout the country entails a considerable amount of thought and labor—which will be greatly increased as this work progresses. At this moment about forty copies of the "Teachers' Manual" have been ordered by Single Taxers who have signified their intention of starting classes. An account of John Lawrence Monroe's field work along these lines appears elsewhere in this issue. An elaborate system of co-ordinating these extension classes with the headquarters in New York is now being put in operation, so that the results of this wide-spread teaching will be properly recorded and ultimately brought to fruition. It is the hope of the Board of Trustees that Single Taxers everywhere will undertake this work of teaching classes in "Progress and Poverty" through the use of the "Teachers' Manual" so that the gospel may be spread faster and more thoroughly than has ever been done before. A thousand classes of at least ten students in each, should be the goal in 1935.

Every month the School conducts an open forum in the Pythian Temple. These forums have for their objective not only the spreading of our philosophy, but also the more definite one of attracting prospective students to the School. Lack of funds prevents the holding of more frequent forums, which would be much more desirable.

Mr. Fowles regrets that the Correspondence Course work has lagged. It is hoped that some day funds will be available to extend this department, which can be made a very valuable part of the School's endeavors. The cost of securing correspondence students, as well as the clerical labor entailed, have made it necessary to neglect the Correspondence Course for the moment in favor of the more productive class and extension courses.

During the first semester of our first year, fifty-three men and women spent sixteen weeks in the study of "Progress and Poverty" and of "Protection or Free Trade." Thirty-seven of these continued for another similar period in the further study of the philosophy.

During this first semester of the second year 180 were

enrolled in our "Progress and Poverty" course, and of these 143 have attended the weekly sessions in sufficient regularity to have gained a knowledge of our philosophy and the aims of the reform we propose. At this writing these students are engaged in a study of "Protection or Free Trade." None had had any previous contact with our philosophy.

Thus, we report an increase in this first semester of nearly two hundred per cent over the first semester of last year, and we have every reason to look for a corresponding increase in enrollment for the second semester, beginning next February 4.

Mention should be made here of the excellent volunteer services of Stephen Bell, Otto Dorn, and Will Lissner in teaching classes. The director will be called upon to enlist other valiant stalwarts in the movement this coming term, not only with classes in the School, but also in taking care of classes it is planned to form outside the School.

Things are happening, we repeat. The seed sown by the noble Oscar H. Geiger is bearing fruit. With the co-operation of Single Taxers everywhere the Henry George School of Social Science can become the means of making our philosophy known throughout the country.

**I**F Democratic congressmen and senators have any brains at all they know that the tariff should either be lowered or raised. Knowing this the duty is up to them to do the raising or lowering and not pass the buck to President Roosevelt. If their brains are less than the average amount they can show it by raising the tariff in spite of all experience and common sense. If no less than the average they can find by putting them to use that the tariff should be lowered. If above the average they can easily discover that the tariff should be abolished and will so decree. But if they have none the fact will be admitted by their surrender of power to the President.

**A**S chief of the N.R.A. General Johnson fixed Alabama coal miners' wages at \$4.60 a day. The operators threatened to close the mines and Johnson surrendered. Wages were made \$3.80. The operators control the land and those who control the land have more to say about wages than General Johnson. But land monopoly is still a sacred cow to the administration.

**S**ATAN rebuking sin is never convincing however reprehensible the sin may be. So the old guard protectionist Republicans who find fault with the Roosevelt policies fail to be impressive.

**S**ECRETARY of Agriculture Wallace finds that 50,000,000 acres of good farming land must be withdrawn from production if the present tariff is maintained. That is how the tariff "makes jobs."

## Report of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

DECEMBER—JANUARY, 1935

**T**HE pamphlet, "100 Years of Land Gambling," a review of Homer Hoyt's book "One Hundred Years of Land Values in Chicago," by our president M. Hennessy, has been attracting attention. Some 13,000 copies were sent out during October and November. Among those who have written to the Foundation commending the pamphlet are: Hon. Dan Fellows Platt; Ida Tarbell; Norman Thomas; Father Coughlin; Housing Study Guild of New York; Walter Nesbit, Congressman; and those who have asked for large supplies for distribution include Mr. Swinney of Los Angeles; Mr. Paige of the Governmental Research Bureau, Chicago. Mr. Paige received 200 copies for the members of his Bureau; Dr. Gleason of St. Mary's College, Kansas; Steel & Co., brokers, Fort Worth, Texas. The Rev. Baska of St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan., wrote as follows:

"I have read the article to my class in Economic History of the United States, for we have been recently studying the booms and speculations in lands during the last century of our history.

"My class consists of 57 students, and 14 of them hail from Chicago. They were extremely anxious to get a copy of this article hence I am writing in their behalf."

A supply was sent (we have had former pleasant contacts with this college), and further word was received from Dr. Baska of the interest of his students in this review.

There is, in the department of economics of the New York Public Library at 42nd Street, a section devoted entirely to material about Henry George. Through the donations of Mrs. de Mille, original manuscripts and precious scrap books containing a newspaper record of Henry George's remarkable career, are available for display. Many historically important and valuable documents are to be found in a glass-enclosed case. All books written by or about Henry George are on call. Rollin Sawyer compiled a catalogue around (1926) of about 90 pages, listing all the documents, and all books that contain mention of Henry George.

Through the courtesy of Mr. C. LeBaron Goeller, clippings concerning the administration and activities of the Fels Fund were turned over to the Foundation some time ago. Recently this file was given to the Library at 42nd Street, with the understanding that they would arrange it in scrap book form, and add it to the Henry George collection.

The Foundation has kept a scrap book record of all publicity on the subject of Henry George, the Single Tax, etc., since 1926. These news clippings and magazine articles occupy ten large scrap books. They have been

given to the Library collection, and thus there is now a permanent and unbroken news record of the progress of the Henry George movement from his own time to the present.

We have to acknowledge the receipt of two bound volumes of the Dutch paper *Justice and Liberty* sent to us by Mr. Kolthek who is now preparing a Dutch translation of "Progress and Poverty." He says: "The propoganda is going strong in our little country, and we are hopeful for the near future."

Mr. Joel Landres arranged to donate to the Henry Street Settlement a complete set of Henry George books. We mention this for the general information of New York Single Taxers.

Early in December Mr. Chandler held a Dinner of the New Jersey Single Tax League, which is described elsewhere in this number. He kindly invited the Foundation to prepare a literature table, as there were to be many strangers present. The writer arranged to have a table at the entrance of the hall, and displayed only a few of the many books that are on the Foundation booklist. But interest centered on these few—"Social Problems," "Significant Paragraphs," "Progress and Poverty," and "The Philosophy of Henry George,"—scarcely a book was left at the end of the evening, all of the copies having been sold, and orders received for additional copies.

May we take this opportunity to say that at every lecture, gathering, study class, or other semi-public meeting of Single Taxers, it would be an excellent plan to have a literature table. During the lecture only a few words need be said about the books, but if they are mentioned, and it is explained that a better grasp can be had of the real meaning and importance of Henry George, if his books are read, it will be found that the usefulness of the lecture itself has been increased.

In this connection, we are advised that Mr. George Briggs, Mr. R. E. Chadwick, Mr. H. H. Ferrell, Mr. L. J. Quinby, Mr. George Shaffer and Mr. David Woodhead will conduct a series of lectures on "The Philosophy of Henry George" at the First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., beginning March 6. Arrangements as described above are being made. Incidentally this idea of Mr. Brigg's and his associates, of having a series of addresses, is an excellent one, and could be carried out by Georgists in many cities.

Among the many hundreds who have corresponded with the Foundation office during the past month, are Mr. Eckert, Mr. Preston, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Berkowitz, Mr. Recker, Mr. Marquardt and Mr. John Allen, all of whom have obtained books in considerable quantities, and have done personal "missionary work" in interesting their friends and business colleagues in "Progress and Poverty" or "Social Problems."

Through the kindness of Mr. John S. Codman, we

have 100 copies of his handsomely bound book "Unemployment and the Revenue Problem" on hand for distribution. A copy will be sent to anyone who desires it upon receipt of twelve cents in stamps to cover postage. Likewise, we have 600 copies of Mr. Ralston's book "What's Wrong With Taxation" (paper covers). This book is available at twenty-five cents per copy, postpaid.

While Mr. John L. Monroe visited this city, we had the pleasure of conferring with him upon his plans for extending the work of the Henry George School. Mr. Monroe plans to start "teachers" in the organization of classes in various cities throughout the country, the teachers to use the "Teachers Manual" issued by the Henry George School in New York.

While these plans were being made we were in touch with the following well known Single Taxers who had already organized extension classes: Mr. Hardinge, Mr. Tideman, Mr. Munch, (Minneapolis); Mr. Schwartz, same city; Mr. Alper, St. Louis; Mr. Sikes of Kansas; Mr. Dennett of New Hampshire; Messrs. Bove, Williams and Briton of Pittsburgh; Mr. Lincoln Crowell, Mass; Mr. Erwin Kauffman, St. Louis; Mr. J. Edward Jones, Oak Park, Ill.

The work that Mr. Bove is doing in Pittsburgh is particularly interesting. He has donated the use of a store for the Henry George literature, and for the activities of the Henry George Club of that city. Mr. Williams and Mayor McNair have undertaken the conduct of a class of 100 in "Progress and Poverty."

During December, a Christmas letter and circular was sent out to about 6,000 names, half of which were new names. About 300 books were sent out in response to this letter and hundreds of letters were written in answer to the orders and special questions that came in. Our records show that about 3,500 books have been distributed since May, 1934, and about 26,000 pamphlets (exclusive of advertising literature). Among the new books available are: "The Science of Political Economy," "The Story of My Dictatorship," and "The Condition of Labor." The former is \$1 the copy (new price); the other two are twenty-five cents each. All are being imported from England.

Of our own new editions Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown says:

"I am favorably impressed by the jacket notes and format. I am anxious that these books "Protection or Free Trade" and "The Land Question" shall do some good and in those cases where I already have a copy, expect to make the new ones available to others."

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Executive Secretary.

SCHOOL teachers were the first public employees whose salaries were cut as a result of the depression. Had they started twenty years ago to teach their classes sound economics there would have been no depression.

## On the March With John Lawrence Monroe

FIELD DIRECTOR, HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL  
OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

**I**F you wish the cooperation of Mr. Monroe in organizing extension classes of the Henry George School of Social Science in your city—

If you can arrange one or more speaking appointments for Mr. Monroe—

Write to the Henry George School of Social Science, 211 W. 79th Street, New York City (or to Mr. Monroe at 538 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago).

The following itinerary gives his schedule for February and March, beginning an extensive tour that will continue on through the Eastern and New England States during the better part of 1935.

### FEBRUARY—MARCH ITINERARY

South Bend, Ind.	- - - - -	February 1-3
Grand Rapids, Mich.	- - - - -	February 4-10
Lansing Mich.	- - - - -	February 11-17
Detroit, Mich.	- - - - -	February 18-March 3
Toledo, Loraine, Sandusky, O.	- - - - -	March 4-10
Cleveland, O.	- - - - -	March 11-13

(All dates are inclusive)

\* \* \*

### HENRY GEORGE FELLOWSHIP DINNER

CHICAGO CHAPTER, JAN. 8, 1935

The first Chicago extension class of the Henry George School of Social Science had its last lesson on December 17. It is a tribute to the class instructor, Mr. Henry L. Tideman, secretary of the Single Tax League, that this was not its last meeting.

By the end of the sixth lesson, the question of "what to do about it?" was a pressing one. By the time of the last lesson the class decided that it would *do something*. The result was the organizing of the Chicago Chapter of the Henry George Fellowship and the holding of the first Fellowship dinner.

This dinner was the occasion of both a commencement exercise and an initiation programme. Certificates of membership in the Chicago Chapter of the Fellowship (national headquarters, 211 W. 79th Street, New York) were presented by Mr. Tideman to all the students who had completed the course of study in "Progress and Poverty"—twenty-two in all.

Nathan Hillman, youthful Chicago attorney, one of the graduates of the class, was chairman. John Lawrence Monroe presented some of the aims of the Henry George School of Social Science and of the Henry George Fellowship.

John Z. White, veteran 83-year old dean of the Single Tax movement, was the guest of honor and made one of the clearest and most forceful addresses of his long and honored career.

Mayor William N. McNair of Pittsburgh, whose hat was first thrown into the political ring twenty-five years ago at the suggestion of Mr. White, made a stirring appeal for outspoken defense of Henry George principles and for courageous action on their behalf.

Three members of the class, Mr. J. E. Trulove, Mr. C. O. Barden, and Luther Browning, were appointed to the Council of Chicago Chapter and each spoke briefly, pledging himself to support the principles of Henry George. As other extension classes come to a close and their members are enrolled in the Fellowship, three of each of their numbers will be appointed to the Council, thus creating an active body for bringing together the new leaders in the movement.

The roster of the Chicago Chapter of the Henry George Fellowship—all graduates of the class in "Progress and Poverty"—is:

Mr. C. O. Barden, Bert Beduhn, William Belmonte, Luther Browning, Irving J. Clague, Bernard Collins, James Farmer, Jr., Walter J. Groh, Nathan Hillman, James L. Holder, Richard Hubbard, Myron T. Monsen, Roger O. Neill, Mr. F. Newell, Gilbert O. Segerdahl, George L. Siemers, Dale E. Smith, Pierce Temple, Miss Dorothy Tideman, Earl E. Trott, Mr. J. E. Trulove, Maurice Welty.

The dinner was held at the Central Y. M. C. A.; forty-four attended.

### MAYOR McNAIR'S CHICAGO VISIT

Mayor McNair of Pittsburgh spent a busy day in Chicago on Tuesday, Jan. 8. It was devoted to official business—Single Tax business. At noon he addressed the City Club telling them, as the *Daily News* said, "how it is that Pittsburghers have avoided tax fads and remained old fashioned and solvent." He described the Pittsburgh Plan of taxation and denounced such "fads" as the sales tax.

In the afternoon Mayor McNair met Mayor Kelly of Chicago. At 4:00 o'clock Mayor McNair and George M. Strachan had a 40-minute conversation on the Single Tax over WCFL, radio station of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Over forty letters were received in response from interested listeners.

In the evening the Mayor addressed the Henry George Fellowship dinner.

Mayor McNair plans to take a leave of absence for a month in the spring and devote it to speaking throughout the country. His tour may take him to the Pacific Coast to participate in the campaign for Judge Ralston's constitutional amendment.

**D**RIVEN off the land, destitute, in rags, thousands of sharecroppers and tenant farmers are face to face with starvation in the cotton belt. These sharecroppers and their families are scattered over nine States. They are the victims of the AAA acreage-reduction programme.—J. CLARK WALDRON in *Nation*.

## Are Conventions Worth While?

THE value of conventions in the life of any association or movement, whether organized or unorganized is, it seems to me, so self-evident as to leave little, if any, ground for debate. But such conventions must be regarded as means to an end, not as an end in themselves. It would be very unfortunate if we were so to lose our sense of proportion as to look upon the annual Henry George Congress as representing any great achievement in and of itself. Such a Congress can be of value only in so far as it serves to educate its participants, to develop a greater degree of agreement and cooperation, inspire renewed zeal, bring about an improvement in methods or technique and expand activities which will advance the movement which it seeks to represent and express.

When the first Henry George Congress was held in Philadelphia in September, 1926, there was no definite intention on the part of its sponsors to make it an annual function, nor would we now insist that there should be any rigid adherence to any fixed procedure, either with regard to time, place or type of programme. But this initial Congress was welcomed so heartily by all participating that in response to the demand, it was deemed wise by the directors of the Henry George Foundation sponsoring the Congress to continue such gatherings as long as results achieved seemed to justify the effort or until a better plan might be devised for enlisting a greater degree of effective team work on the part of Single Taxers. In view of the sustained interest and of pressing invitations from Single Tax groups in various cities and towns, these national conventions or conferences have been maintained without a break for a period of nine years. Our hopes as to witnessing a great revival in the Single Tax movement have, I may frankly say, been realized only in a very small measure but we have nevertheless felt it our duty to persist in the effort, so that whatever has been gained might be conserved.

Personally, I welcome the freest discussion of this question on the part of all interested but I feel that the criticism recently expressed by my very good friend, the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, is wrongly directed and rests, in part at least, on unsound premises. It is clear, of course, that no individual or organization has, or can have, any monopoly of the Single Tax movement. The doors are always wide open. Would it not therefore be well to direct our attention to the things that are left undone rather than to disparage what has been done? For we must all grant that much has been left undone and perplexing problems as to "how to put it over" remain unsolved after more than fifty years of experimentation and earnest striving.

The recent Henry George Congress held in Chicago was not only, in the opinion of many who attended, one of the best Single Tax conventions yet held but it was

probably the least expensive Single Tax convention of national scope ever held. All of the work incident to the planning and execution of the convention (which is considerable) was done by volunteer workers receiving no financial remuneration (and this includes a rather voluminous correspondence, not to mention much other work), the expense being limited to the cost of printing, postage and a few incidental expenses which were largely defrayed by five dollar contributions, voluntarily offered by those friends who felt that the modest investment was worth while.

As for the traveling expenses incurred by those attending, including hotel accommodations, meals, etc., which someone has estimated might aggregate as much as ten thousand dollars (but as to which no one can speak except the individuals who may have kept personal expense accounts), we may grant, of course, that there might have been a few persons in the assembly who, had they not attended, would have contributed the expenses of their trip directly to some form of Single Tax propaganda. But of how many is this likely true? Is it not more likely that by reason of attending the annual rally, many of these persons will actually increase the contribution that they would otherwise have made to their favorite type of Single Tax work for the current year. For it must be remembered that attendance at these annual gatherings is purely optional and that it has necessarily been largely limited to those who have time, money and inclination to travel, many of whom travel occasionally in any event for their own pleasure or self-improvement. As a matter of fact, many of those attending the conventions during the past two years were persons who had planned to visit the World's Fair and arranged their trip so that they could also get the benefits to be derived from fellowship with their fellow Georgists and from the exchange of ideas and information, if nothing more. Furthermore, with the exception of a small group of leaders, there are few who undertake to attend each year and for this reason the conventions are held in different sections from time to time and each convention represents in large part a new group, many of whom do not need to travel any great distance.

As one deeply interested in the cause of economic righteousness, I should like to see not merely an examination and appraisal of our annual convention, but a very earnest examination and appraisal of the Single Tax movement as a whole. If our movement is to thrive and grow and meet the challenge of the times in which we live, it should receive the best thought of our ablest minds, not merely for two or three days out of a year, but continuously, until a way is discovered by which the movement, founded by the great philosopher, may actually obtain some degree of momentum here in the United States.

Let us discuss and let us act in the light of the best

ideas we can obtain. Let us analyze our situation to discover what, if any, weaknesses stand in the way of progress. Among other things, the disciples of Henry George must learn how to organize. The national conference, or convention, was intended to be a step toward effective organization but the problem of organization in the Single Tax movement presents special difficulties not to be found in like nature in most other movements, if indeed in any other comparable movement, for Single Taxers are notoriously individualistic in promotional activities as well as in their social and economic philosophy.

In my judgment, really effective organization depends upon the formulation of something more appealing than mere academic education, important as that is in its own sphere. If the Single Tax movement is to attain great strength and achieve more rapid progress, it must, in my opinion, heed the advice of Henry George on the subject of "practical politics." The political and economic situation today is, of course, different in certain respects from that prevailing in the days when Henry George engaged in his political activities but the central idea, which he advanced as to ways and means is, if anything, more sound to day than it was then. The fact remains that until his followers can correlate their movement with some outstanding popular issue, the work of education as well as the work for legislation will probably continue to be confined to the restricted circles of the elect and thus fail to reach the masses. Until a solution is found, would it be wise to neglect the opportunity for suggestions and discussion and reports, which such an annual conference does afford, if nothing more?

Criticism of any particular type of convention programme is certainly in order and there is much room for improvement in this regard. This matter is entitled to earnest consideration, if we are to continue to have such annual or occasional gatherings, and I believe it was decided at Chicago to experiment the next time with a different type of convention procedure with a view to better results. But as to the specific criticism advanced in reporting the last Congress, it seems to me that there is something that might be said in reply. It is alleged that Single Taxers have at times been exposed to the painful experience of listening to certain speakers who are inclined to present a critical attitude. Now, if a convention is held for the sole purpose of obtaining newspaper publicity or impressing visitors with the thought that we are all like-minded in every respect, then perhaps addresses of a controversial or critical nature should be tabooed and we might well abandon any thought of introducing a variety of discussion. I believe that the convention programmes might be greatly improved by more careful planning and selection, but it is also my opinion that Single Taxers attending such meetings are benefitted, rather than harmed, by occasionally exposing themselves to a discussion of related questions from a slightly different viewpoint, rather than insisting upon

a rigid adherence to a restricted field of discussion. For example, whatever we may think of public ownership of public utilities as an immediate and separate issue, it is certainly a part of the programme advocated by Henry George and being a Henry George Congress, or such discussion in several years would hardly seem to be in the nature of undue emphasis. And touching upon proportional representation as another example, if we have any interest at all in methods of securing results in practical application, a discussion of effective political machinery for the attainment of our ends is certainly in order. Even the money question, which surely has had a very small place in any of the conferences, is not entirely foreign to the Georgist philosophy and programme and Single Taxers cannot afford to be ignorant of the subject when proposing to present the solution of our economic problem. And in working out concrete tax plans in a *transitional* stage, no matter how orthodox we may be, we shall probably have to tolerate some forms of taxation other than that on land values; hence it may even be profitable to give some consideration to the question of what kind of existing taxes might well be discarded first and in fact to anything having a bearing upon the development of a practical step-by-step programme, which could hope to win popular support in our day or in the present crisis. But in any event is it not true that fully ninety-five per cent of all convention time has been devoted strictly to discussion relating to the Single Tax in its various aspects?

Finding Single Taxers differing sharply in their opinions as to just what should be done and how those ends could be best attained, the Henry George Congress was conceived as a means of providing, if nothing more, an open forum of free speech where all of those interested in the philosophy and teachings of Henry George might meet as opportunity affords itself for earnest discussion and exchange of ideas in the faith that such free discussion would certainly tend to bring about better understanding and a greater degree of united action. I believe that the Henry George Congress has been fruitful in this respect, but I am eager to see much more accomplished in the years that lie immediately ahead. Certainly the time is now at hand when we might well subordinate discussion to action. Regardless of whether or not general agreement can be obtained in support of any particular concrete programme, it is earnestly to be hoped that those who have such programmes developed, will proceed to submit them to the test of practical experience and let the results speak for themselves.

P. R. WILLIAMS.

**T**HE St. Lawrence Seaway is popular with officeseekers. Its building will encourage foreign trade, thus creating need of additional custom house officials to discourage this trade again.



## Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

THERE has been a notable increase in the number of visitors at the new quarters of the Club at 1165 Broadway, particularly by out-of-town Single Taxers.

The plan for placing the finances of the Club on a stable basis by securing pledges for definite monthly contributions is now assured of success, though the expansion of activities now under way will use advantageously the further financial support which, from present indications, is sure to be forthcoming in generous measure during the first six months of 1935.

Our Radio Broadcast Manager, Thomas Lane, claims that our President, Charles H. Ingersoll, will during 1935 far eclipse his pace for last year when he established an all-time world's record for radio propagandist publicity by emitting more than 600 broadcasts which carried his pungent economic sermonettes to many millions of hearers.

Provision has been made for the weekly printed publication and extensive circulation of these Radio Broadcasts which will be interspersed with interesting current economic items, all focusing on the Single Tax plan for industrial rehabilitation.

The Club is vigorously promoting a plan for inducing the Single Taxers of the metropolitan area to connect themselves with, and to aggressively enter into the work of the local organizations of the two major political parties.

The door of opportunity for work of this kind is wide open for all Single Taxers. Amidst all of the numerous fallacious schemes of the two parties for improving the deplorable conditions which are due to economic maladjustment, the simple and all sufficient formula of the Single Tax, if tactfully presented, is sure of an interested and respectful hearing.

Greater results at less expense can be achieved by Single Taxers in the arena where the actual, practical battles of politics are fought in the local political organizations and clubs and societies, than are possible by any other method. If all of the Single Taxers of the United States will eschew their metaphysical arguments among themselves and go vigorously to work in the great field provided for them by the two major political parties, they can make the Single Tax a live political issue within a year and can accomplish its adoption within a decade.

Pittsburgh should serve as an example and an inspiration for the Single Taxers of this country.

CHARLES S. PRIZER.

A DAM SMITH defined man as an animal that makes bargains—no other animal does that; no dog ever exchanges bones with another.

## Limiting Production

THE proposals which apparently originated in the United States to limit the world production of wheat, and which were considered at the World Economic Conference in London, appear to us to be dangerous in the extreme. In the United States it was proposed to bonus farmers to reduce their acreage of wheat by a certain percentage. Whether or not it is intended that other countries shall adopt the same method of limiting production has not been made clear. A few of many objections we see to this scheme are as follows:

First of all, the statistics available as to world production and supplies are not reliable. The best that can be said for them is that at times they have proved to be reasonably accurate and that they furnish an indication of approximate production. Before the world-wide slump in the price of wheat, which set in during the fall of 1929, all manner of statistics were quoted to prove that the prevailing price of wheat was justified by world production and market conditions. It was because the Western wheat pools relied on this information that they lost millions of dollars and were almost put out of business. To attempt, therefore, to restrict world production on the basis of available statistics is risky in the extreme.

Supposing a country like the United States decides to reduce its total acreage by fifteen per cent. At the time such a decision is reached, conditions might seem to justify such action. But, suppose a crop failure was to follow. Instead of production being decreased fifteen per cent, it might under such conditions be decreased fifty per cent and the results be far from what was intended. How could such a contingency be prevented?

Sometimes what is considered to be over-production is really under-consumption. Today, there appears to be more wheat available than the demand justifies. But, supposing business conditions improve, as there are indications that they soon will, and hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of men now out of work return to employment. The present surplus of wheat would be likely to disappear as though by magic. In such an event, reduced production would mean nothing but loss both to producers and consumers alike.

It has been estimated that some 200,000 additional civil servants would be required in the United States to supervise the enforcement of restrictive enactments on several million farms. Tens of thousands of farmers hearing of the efforts to reduce production, might conclude that the price of wheat was likely to improve and each arrange to increase his acreage by small amounts. How is any government or organization, even with the assistance of 200,000 extra civil servants, going to check the production of tens of thousands of farmers scattered all over the continent? What assurance could farmers in Canada have that farmers in Russia would not increase their production were we to decrease ours? True, Russian Government might undertake to supervise production in that country, but its efforts in that direction so far have proved far from successful. It looks to us as though the less we mix up in undertakings of this kind, the better it will be for all concerned.—*Farm and Dairy*, Peterboro, Ontario.

A POOR tailor in need of work pressed a suit for 35 cents when the code price is 40 cents. For this he was sentenced to \$100 fine and thirty days in jail. No, this is not a tale taken from a history of mediaeval Europe. It happened in 1934 in Jersey City, U. S. A. Proceedings were under the N.R.A., the brain product of economic illiterates who have not advanced beyond mediaeval ideas. They believe a term in jail is the ultimate answer to all economic problems, probably figuring that if enough workers should be sent to jail pressure on those left outside would be relieved and the unemployment problem solved.

## Pittsburgh

### HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OPENS

THE Pittsburgh extension of the Henry George School of Social Science had an auspicious opening on Friday evening, January 4, with an enrollment of sixty students. The University of Pittsburgh has donated one of its classrooms in the downtown branch on the tenth floor of the Chamber of Commerce Building, where all facilities and conveniences are afforded.

Richard E. Howe, formerly of Chicago but now an active leader among the younger group of the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh, is Secretary of the School and the principal instructor, and as a volunteer teacher is giving a great deal of time and attention to the School with a view to making it one of the most successful in the country.

A keen interest is being displayed and another class is in process of formation, to be taught by George E. Evans, President of the Henry George Foundation. The officers of the Henry George Club and Henry George Foundation are actively cooperating as members of the committee in charge of the School.

The present course will run for a period of ten weeks and follows closely the official manual of the Henry George School of Social Science. "Progress and Poverty" is the text book and the classes are being offered free of all charge, except that students when registering pay \$1.00 for the text book. Sessions are held every Friday evening between 8:00 and 10:00 p. m.

\* \* \*

### PITTSBURGH ORGANIZING TO EXTEND GRADED TAX PLAN

An intensive campaign for the further application of land value taxation is under way in connection with the opening in January of the regular session of the Pennsylvania State Legislature and at a meeting held in Pittsburgh on January 3, a campaign committee was organized to sponsor and actively promote bills for the extension of the present graded tax plan in Pittsburgh and also for Allegheny County, with Chief City Assessor P. R. Williams acting as Chairman.

City Solicitor Ward Bonsall has prepared revised drafts of bills which will be promptly introduced when the legislature convenes following the inauguration of Governor George H. Earle on January 15. State Senator Bernard B. McGinnis and Representative John L. Powers of Pittsburgh are among those who are actively interested in promoting this legislation and in view of the fact that two similar bills passed the lower house by large majorities at the special session in December, 1933, the sponsors of the measures are optimistic as to the prospects of securing some important advance at this session, especially in view of the fact that the movement has the whole-hearted support of Mayor McNair's city adminis-

tration, as well as of large numbers of influential citizens.

Prior to the November election, most of the legislators from the City of Pittsburgh had pledged their support as candidates to the extension of the graded tax plan.

The new illustrated booklet, entitled "The McNair Five-to-One Tax Plan," of which John C. Rose, now Secretary of the Department of Assessors, is author, is being widely circulated.

\* \* \*

Mayor McNair is constantly addressing groups of citizens in clubs, churches and civic and commercial organizations, and these addresses are largely devoted to the exposition of his economic principles, thus contributing greatly to the spread of popular knowledge with reference to more scientific methods of taxation.

The Mayor is also speaking this month in Chicago, Ill., and York, Pa., and may accept some invitations from the South in the near future.

JAPANESE statesmen claim that their country is overcrowded. And yet fifty per cent of Japanese farmers are tenants who support themselves and their families from the produce of their tiny two acre farms and give the landlords from fifty to sixty per cent of their produce in rent besides. In addition they support the statesmen who uphold landlordism. Such "overcrowding" should be relieved by getting rid of landlords and landlord-controlled statesmen.

THE law forbids one unable to pass an examination in medicine to make a business of practicing it. It does the same way with the law and some other professions. But however ignorant one may be of economic laws no statute laws prevents him or her from passing as a "professional economist" and teaching economic science—or what he in his ignorance may think to be economic science—in schools or universities. Some such are drawing big salaries for disservices of that kind. Worse than that such incompetents may be elected to legislative bodies or to the presidency where they deal with the economic situation and pass on measures relating to it. No wonder that the economic situation is a muddle.

A RACKETEER is a thickhead who has not learned that certain predatory privileges are reserved for land speculators only.

## BOOK REVIEWS

### NOTES FROM THE MOVEMENT IN DENMARK

En Verdenstankes Vaekst I Vort Folk (Growth of a World-Idea in our Nation) by Signe Björner. Nyt Nordisk Forlag, Kobenhavn 1934.

In her recent book, entitled "Growth of a World-Idea in Our Nation" Signe Björner gives, in interesting animated form, the story of "Georgism," as the Danish Single Taxers call it, in Denmark. The book is not a history of the movement in the usual sense. It is a compilation, in more permanent form, of articles that have appeared

in *Grundskyld*, the Danish quarterly; of addresses given at the International Conference in Copenhagen in 1926, and at other important meetings. The material has been knit together in more or less chronological order, interspersed with notes on personalities, those who are still working for the cause, those who have passed on; with reminiscences of particularly important gatherings and lines of effort that have influenced political action. And through it all pulses the rich personality of the woman who is one of the leading figures of the movement in Denmark, and who yet belongs to our country as well, by her early life and family connections here.

Denmark's importance in the furtherance of the ideal of social justice preached by Henry George, cannot be overlooked. In this energetic modern-minded little country, the purest form of the doctrine is understood, and put into practical action, as nowhere else in Europe. There has never been, in Denmark, any stepping aside towards land-nationalization or communalization, as in England or Germany, for instance. The backbone of the Danish nation now is the free farmer on his own land, and just these "small-holders," as they are called, are the backbone of the Danish land-value taxation movement as well. A movement which they never forget is more than a mere fiscal policy. They understand it as the first and all-important step towards true liberty and justice for the people of any country.

As Mrs. Björner shows us, the Danish Single Tax movement has lived through three distinct periods of growth, separated by intervals of dormancy, due in one case to the World War, in the other, to the world economic depression. It is just now entering on the third period, and promise of new life is given by passage of laws that have written a certain measure of land value taxation into the Danish political edifice.

Touching lightly herself on the first period, Mrs. Björner has given the word there to an article by Dr. Villads Christensen, historian. Dr. Christensen was a sterling fighter for the cause, whose death in 1922, in his best maturity, was a great loss to the movement. His position as curator of the city's archives gave him authority which he used to high advantage in expounding the doctrines of Henry George. His article on the first period of the movement, given in full in Mrs. Björner's book, is a record of importance.

It is interesting to know that the Danish movement, based so largely as it is on that typical Danish class, the "small-holders," had its start and its early roots in another typically Danish institution, the so-called "People's High School," that admirable system of adult education for which Denmark is deservedly famed. Dr. Jacob Lange, still a tower of strength to the movement, gave the first impetus in an article of his in the organ of the People's High Schools. It will be remembered that it was Dr. Lange who first rendered Henry George's most important writings into Danish. Dr. Christensen gives a graphic description of the controversy called forth by Prof. Lange's writings and the first meetings that grew out of it. Even today, the Danish comrades hold their most important conferences and conventions in these High Schools for adult education, a most valuable and fertile field for propaganda. Out of these beginnings grew the first Henry George Club, in 1899. It was not a very husky infant and passed out gently two years later. But its successor, started in 1902, grew lustily and was able to endure although quiescent, even through the war years.

Then (Mrs. Björner herself takes up the tale) came the period of second blooming, culminating in the Parliamentary measures of land value taxation for State and Communal purposes. In this the Danish Georgists had the assistance of the Radical Left Party, of which many of the comrades were members. Their success in bringing about some measure of governmental achievement led to the holding of the Third International Conference for Land Value Taxation in Copenhagen.

Then came the period of world economic doldrums and, as everywhere, the work in Denmark languished. For even Denmark, with its interesting and valuable economic innovations, could not but feel

the grip of the universal calamity. And amid frantic governmental efforts to improve the situation came protectionist measures which discouraged and angered the Danish Single Taxers. But the tide seems turning now, and the various organizations are going ahead with renewed energy, finding a public once again ready to listen to some more fundamental remedy.

Mrs. Björner does not attempt to hide or palliate the disagreements among the Danish comrades, the same there as with us or anywhere where there is an alive and vital progress in the movement. In Denmark, as with us, the main discussions as to ways and means hinge on the two divergent paths of political action or educative work. The Danish League of Justice, a political party of Single Taxers, was formed against much opposition, even from the leading workers. But it accomplished its purpose of electing several members to the Parliament (four, at the moment), and does seem to have been useful. So much so, that even those who first protested are now helping. The work of education is going on actively. And as a number of the leading Danish comrades are principals or instructors in the group of People's High Schools, the study of fundamental economics and just taxation has become a part of the curriculum of many such establishments.

The charming personal note Mrs. Björner gives her book, introducing many of her fellow-workers to us, with photographs and the story of their labors, makes it delightful reading. Even in its easy informal manner, it is a document of lasting value. And it bears a message of encouragement to us all, in its story of what one little country has accomplished, and what it is still planning to do.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### A SPARKLING WORK

*Sociocratic Escapades*, by Francis Neilson, 12mo., clo., 319 pp. Price \$2. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London.

Who was it said political economy was a dull subject? He must have been blind to the screaming fun that is hidden away in what is taught as political economy. Is there anything really quite as funny as Malthus and the Malthusian theory, a curious caricature of the Creator at the hands of a preacher of Christianity? Or anything quite as subtly humorous as the Wage Fund theory in which it is assumed that labor, which produces all wealth and therefore its own wages, is dependent upon a mythical sum which nobody has ever seen set aside in some mysterious way to keep the workers employed. Due to its obvious absurdity this theory has not the strength it once had, though it bobs up every now and then.

Is there anything quite as amusingly ridiculous as the economic doctors at Washington busy with their fantastic devices. Some day a new Gilbert and Sullivan will embody them in some comic opera and the people of 1950 will laugh their heads off, but will say that of course it is grossly exaggerated. It seems unkind and perhaps a little disrespectful to picture the Chief Executive who gave away billions of other people's money as the Lord Bountiful of a spending campaign in which dollars are made to figure as pennies.

Man is an "amoozin' cuss," as Artemus Ward called him, and he is never quite as amusing as when he is reconstructing the economic edifice and piecing together the sorry patchwork of his substitute planning for the plan of nature. Marx, Tugwell, Richberg, Harry Hopkins, and the late General Johnson in his character of Coney Island barker for the administration—all are supremely amusing playboys amid the eternal verities they do not understand.

Because Francis Neilson is keenly alive to all this he has made a sparkling book. He sees all the funny spectacles provided and he just canters through them in a spirit of positive enjoyment in the havoc he is wreaking. He is having a good time and he shares it with his readers. If there is any stupid pretender who escapes his sharpened spear it is because he is too insignificant to be noted.

There are keen thrusts at Richberg, Lippman, Norman Thomas, all in surpassingly good humor. There is a whimsical defense of

gambling and gamblers which has much underlying truth. And his defense of the American business man who has been abused, lampooned and blackguarded is a spirited and admirable rebuke to the direct charges and covert insinuations emanating from Washington.

There are searching criticisms of the opinions of Justice Brandeis, Holmes and Cardoza, and in these Mr. Neilson shows how shaky and unfixed are the foundations of their democracy, how very questionable are their definitions and their attempts to arrive at conclusions which will leave our institutions invulnerable to attack. He does not spare them, and to Justice Cardoza, who says: "Men are saying today that property, like all social institutions, has a social function to fill," he applies the quick rejoinder: "Property is not a social institution." The mere fact of saying it is a social institution does not make it so."

The lance carried by Francis Neilson is not always pointed in sheer enjoyment of the mischief he is making for the real enemies of a true social order. He is not solely concerned in showing up the curious and often comical misconceptions. We would not have our readers think there is not a very serious undertone to this remarkable book. Francis Neilson is very much perturbed about the future of the nation and the world. He surveys conditions with a sorrow that informs what the reader may sense at times as levity. But beneath it all is a profound seriousness which the judicious reader will discern. We append a few extracts which will give a taste of what is in store for those who will procure the book, and read it from cover to cover, which we trust will be all who read this very inadequate review.

It is sad to think of the intelligentsia of the Sociocratic Party meeting in Chicago and never dreaming what they were in for. Little did they dream once Roosevelt had accepted the nomination that they were on their way to bury the Democratic Party in a non-sectarian cemetery, the only successful collectivist undertaking. Page 41.

Poor labor, your devoted leaders in the Unions and the Houses of Legislature throughout the land know little what bills are piling up all over the country that you will have to foot. One of your true friends told you years ago what would happen, but you were too pre-occupied with nominal wages and shorter hours to give thought to his warnings. He told you that poverty advanced with progress, and so it does. Page 37.

One can acquire a reputation nowadays as a rhetorician by making a speech in which nothing of importance has been said. We have had oceans of them ever since NRA set to work. Our great propagandists, in and out of government, must live in Mason jars. The air never gets at them. Page 78.

For clarity of statement and beauty of prose where will you find in our sociologists, social service people, and relief dispensers anything that can be compared with a work by Eddington, or Jeans, or Herrick, or Sir. William Bragg? These people write prose as poets do. When one turns to the New Dealers' works, the planners' books, and reads their sentences, crepitant Latinisms, and all the hocus pocus verbiage that covers up a host of literary deficiencies, he wonders how university faculties can persist in encouraging the departments through which these authors pass. Page 98.

One reason why our president is concerned about our natural resources is that at one time in this country there were opportunities given to our simple and primitive folk to build homes. But now "the frontier has disappeared." Of course it has. Government stood by and watched it disappear. Page 115.

The man who gave to mankind a set of principles which would lay a sure foundation on which to build a future from the injustices, antagonisms and distinction of class and race that afflict the world today was Henry George. But so far mankind in several countries of which I have had experience, shows little or no inclination to benefit from his work. Yet everybody seems to know something about Henry George. His name appears in editorials, presidents of universities refer to him, statesmen in various countries have caught millions of votes by using his name. At one time in England he was the most popular and unpopular man in this world. Page 120.

Here we see that the essential step in doing something for humanity is to remove injustice. And Henry George has shown simply and clearly what steps are to be taken to carry out this fundamental reform.

Is it a panacea? I do not know. Suppose the reform is carried

out; is there any hope that man will then be happy? I do not know. For happiness, it seems to me, is a question of personal concern quite as much as religion. But this I do know, that there is no other way of setting man on the road to happiness. There is no other way. Pages 124-5.

I knew some one connected with this administration would say, "Our new structure is a part and fulfillment of the old. All that we do seeks to fulfill the historic traditions of the American people." The little grocer who gave a loaf of bread with two quarts of milk he sold to a customer was convicted and fined. I presume that that was according to the historic traditions of the American people. Pages 140-1.

Mr. Roosevelt has my profound sympathy. It seems to me that he is rather new at the game. His speeches seem to indicate that much. He seems to be surrounded by a crowd of people who have the most extraordinary ideas about humankind. There is not one who has delivered a speech or written a book who seems to be conscious for a moment that the working classes are composed of human beings. They seem to picture them as a lot of surpliced choir boys marching down the aisle to service. They never picture the choir boys with the surplices off, before or after the service. Page 173.

Perhaps Mr. Thomas (Norman Thomas) will have an opportunity some day of making a study of the question what is and what is not property. And when he starts about it, he will find that the law of property arises out of the law of social justice. Socialists from the beginning found the law of property the greatest obstacle in their way. So they determined that they would abrogate that law and at one fell swoop, a genius among them decided that there was no such thing as justice and, in abandoning justice, they abandoned economic fundamentals and ethics of which they are the basis. To what extraordinary shifts are men pushed when reason is thrown to the winds! Page 246.—J. D. M.

#### WELL MEANING—BUT?

Utopia Dawns, by John Pratt Whitman, 20 Union Park, Boston, Mass. 144 pp. Price \$2.

We do not like Utopias. Nothing has ever come of them and most of them have disappeared. They read well on paper but they break down in practice.

This is an interesting account of Utopias, those that have disappeared and those on paper, from Plato to Wells. It is curious to note how the makers of these manufactured Utopias propose to regiment the children, no doubt because they are more easily regimented than the "grown ups." Plato questioned the ability of parents to rear their children properly so he would turn them over to the state. Robert Owen in like manner would have done the same, beginning with children of one year of age. In the Utopia pictured by Andrae in 1691 children were to be submitted to like regimentation. It seems to have been a habit of all of them to consider that if men and women were not the pawns of the state children certainly were. Poor kids!

But these Utopians meant well and there is something catching in their enthusiasm. Mr. Whitman believes that the time is at hand for the adoption of Henry George's proposals and he has a rather interesting chapter on Henry George with a portrait of the great economist.—J. D. M.

#### AN IMPORTANT VOLUME

We have received from the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade the "Conference Papers" presented at the Fourth Annual Convention at Edinburgh, July and August, 1929. This volume bound in stiff paper covers contains the Declaration of Principles and Policy, the remarkable opening address by Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, president of the International Union, and addresses on Land Value Taxation and Free Trade in Denmark by F. Folke and K. J. Kristensen, The Influence of Henry George in Denmark by Jacob E. Lange, and Spohus Berthelson, papers on the movement in Australia by E. J. Craigie and A. G. Huie, and one by Alan C. Thompson, treating of the movement in Canada. Others represented are John J. Murphy, Dr. Alex Paletta, Otto Cullinan, C. H. Nightingale, Carl Marfels, F. C. R. Douglass, Chester C. Flatt

(now gone from us) Byron Holt, (also passed on) Pavlos Gianellia and a number of others.

A hitherto unpublished address by Henry George is the concluding paper. This interesting and valuable work of 250 pages can be had of the Treasurer of the International Union, Mr. Ashley Mitchell, 94 Petty France, London, S. W. I., England, for two shillings and six pence. It is exceedingly interesting and informing and is the most important contribution made to the history of the movement since the Single Tax Year Book was published from this office in 1917. Of course much that is contained in these "Conference Papers" is supplementary thereto, since they cover later years.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

We have received from the United Committee, 94 Petty France, London, S. W. I., England, a number of recently issued pamphlets as follows:

Unemployment and the Land, by W. R. Lester.

The Only Way Out of Unemployment, by Henry George Chancellor.

Russian Lessons, by A. W. Madsen.

Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, by Harry Crossley.

Cities Held to Ransom, by M.

Justice the Object, Taxation the Means, by Henry George.

The Beneficence of Natural Law in the Economic World, by Charles H. Smithson. (Recalling Oscar H. Geiger's remarkable address under the same title.)

These should be in the hands of all our friends. They are written with the thoroughness and clarity that characterize the work of our English friends. Every one of these pamphlets is worth while.

In addition to these there has arrived a new edition of "The Story of My Dictatorship," attractively garbed in stiff red paper cover and comprising 90 pages. It can be had for a shilling.

## Correspondence

### AS TO INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your review (Sept.-Oct. issue) of Green's book, "The Profits of the Earth," properly condemns his appeal to the teachings of Henry George in support of "the thesis that interest will not persist in a society where the full economic rent is appropriated by government." Even if he intended to refer only to George's fundamental teachings he was bound to make clear that George specifically endorsed it.

But are you dealing with the thesis itself as Single Tax progress practically demands in view of present resistance? We know that George did not go into the great reducing effect of Single Tax on present interest; by the eliminating from its support of diverted rent which is one-half,—and the *certain* part—of all present interest payments. That he simply contended that increased production due to capital would amply support interest notwithstanding such lost support; and that this morally belonged to capital.

But business men, and even consumers generally, know from common experience that the selling prices of all products—including cows and calves as well as planes and planks—are determined solely by the variable supply offered; so that both reproduction and tool values attaching to them are actually distributed generally, just as Single Tax would distribute generally the values attaching to land. Shall Single Taxers deny that calves and planks and cows and tools must and do sell on the common cost basis? And shall we stand regardless of this on the moral theory that capital (the product of expended labor) gives out "stored labor" interminably;—thus allying ourselves with the present Frankenstein monster which makes \$20,000 of capital the equivalent of a never-dying live worker? Or shall we stand simply on the sound ground that capital will get only what its possible scarcity may command, plus any shared profits (excess wages, etc.) of special enterprise?

Of course this interest matter is "immaterial," as George says, to the essential merits of his Single Tax remedy. But *the actual identifying* of Single Tax with continuance of the present certain-interest burden, *is killing its natural broad appeal*. And it is suicidal to retain such a position unless the vague contention that it "can be defended as a form of deferred wages" is backed by convincing proof that deferred wages are equitably entitled to or can get more *than the expended labor they represent*. Antagonizing the masses foolishly is a crime against our cause, swinging them from individual freedom to Socialism. Will not LAND AND FREEDOM help Single Tax progress by standing simply on the law of supply and demand for capital?

Is the fact recognized that Single Taxers who teach that interest is natural and will persist, logically endorse the Socialistic contention that Single Tax alone is futile—"not enough?" For what sort of an ideal would Single Tax satisfy if millions of workers (say one for each \$20,000 of capital) must interminably support thousands of mere owners of capital, who are just as useless as mere owners of land? Would Single Tax be enough?

Yet that is what capitalists and workers are told will be the Single Tax outcome. If false,—what fools we be? And we have only to open our eyes to obvious facts in the everyday competitive selling and buying of *all* labor products on the cost-of-production basis; and our minds to untrammelled common sense reasoning, in order to *know*. If mistaken as to this "immaterial" matter which never-the-less controls attitude towards the great land value cause, is allowed to kill its progress, we are responsible for the killing.

Reading, Pa.

WALTER G. STEWART.

### SOME PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In view of the difference of opinion regarding the subject of interest among the followers of Henry George, and the contention of some (a minority) that he was wrong, it seems important that this matter should be gone into deeply, his position thoroughly examined, and if possible definite conclusions arrived at.

In this brief comment I cannot do more than outline a practical phase which may help to clear the situation.

George's position is stated in "Progress and Poverty," pages 173 to 203, inclusive, and should be carefully reread and particular attention paid to the chapter on "Spurious Capital." I emphasize this chapter because as soon as one eliminates all spurious capital much that confuses thought on interest is also eliminated and leaves only the products of labor as capital. In this way if a full and clear title is given to labor, to the product which labor produces, we might give thought to the idea that the producer should, in equity, be compensated if he forswears enjoyment and grants temporary title, *viz., lends to another*. It is beside the point to contend that if every one received the full product of his labor there would be little borrowing and much to lend. The much to lend, and the lack of borrowers might reduce loans to zero and consequently no interest and no interest rate whatsoever. In all probability under just and equitable conditions this would prove to be the case, but the point to consider is, if borrowing takes place under any conditions, is interest as a principle just?

In "Progress and Poverty," page 187, in the last paragraph regarding interest, George concludes: "It is therefore just." If interest is just it ought to prove out now in practice without waiting for the millennium or any other future development. But it is most essential that we find out what George meant by interest which he upholds and not confuse it in any way with the return from capitalized privilege, or that basic privilege, land monopoly and its concomitant, over-capitalization. Nor should our thought be confounded with sentiment, *viz.,* whether it is permissible for one man to do no labor and another labor to pay him interest. It should be considered as a

principle, whether in all ways it is just and equitable or the opposite.

Let us take the self-evident truth that all wealth is the product of labor applied to land and hold in abeyance "assisted by capital." Let us consider the return wages and rent and prove out if possible that interest is the just return of capital. Disregarding economic theory entirely, what is meant by interest in the ordinary processes of production and distribution? It is a payment additional to the amount of a loan. Note that it is interest we are considering, not the rate by which the amount is determined. A bird's-eye view of production and distribution, viz., business processes, may be obtained by examination of the main elements of a typical balance sheet. A balance sheet gives the condition of a corporation or other form of business at a given time and is the result of income account and supporting data over a previous period. On the debit side note fixed and current assets, on the credit side liabilities and balancing items. In the net current positions we have movables, such as cash, goods, etc. These are labor products (cash is equivalent) and constitute legitimate capital. In the fixed asset position we have a different picture, land and buildings and other immovables. The last two are labor products and therefore legitimate capital. Land is another thing entirely; labor did not create it nor has any one ever had the right to exclusive ownership. Land is the source of wealth and while it may be capitalized it is not capital. To the extent that economic rent is not taken in taxation it may be and is capitalized and it is this value that appears in the balance sheet. Conversely if all economic rent were taken in lieu of taxation, or, which amounts to the same thing, if all land (capitalized) value were taxed to the amount of the economic rent, that capitalized value would be approximately zero in the balance sheet. This is the "spurious capital" referred to and would any follower of Henry George consider interest on such as other than spurious?

On the other hand, consider labor products as appearing in the balance sheet. In the case of buildings would any one question this interest return? If so, would they question as expense payment on the use of the buildings if ownership were retained by the builders and used by the operators whose balance sheet we are considering? Or take the machinery produced by manufacturers of machinery who retain ownership, would any one question an expense account as in the use of the buildings? The net return on either is interest. It is compensation for loss of what is termed in law "enjoyment," viz., *use by the makers*. It is payment for use (in time) of labor products, legitimate capital, and it is therefore natural and just and if not paid must be charged to charity instead of equity.

C. H. KENDAL.

#### NOTE BY THE EDITOR

We want to add a few words to what Mr. Kendall has written. With much that is confused as interest-payments swept away, or clearly identified as rent, and with increase of lenders and decrease of borrowers—a condition resulting from more equitable distribution—it seems clear that the rate of interest—payments for the loans of capital—will decline.

But does this mean that interest itself will decline (interest being the result of added efficiency due to capital), or, as George contended, rise as wages rise? There is no real contradiction here, since, under more equitable distribution there will be a great increase in the number of owners of capital, with results that are easily predictable.

So whether George is right or his critics are right makes little difference. If interest goes to the owners of capital and everybody has capital, it would seem that the matter is bound to work out satisfactorily under *the natural laws of equity*.

If to go into business, or to make additions to existing businesses, men borrow capital, and by reasons of such loans prosper, equity demands a return to the lender. If the right to such a return is denied the transaction, as Mr. Kendal happily suggests, is one of charity.

What seems to worry many of those who question the justice of interest is its supposed perpetuity. Thus our friend Mr. Stewart

in a communication received subsequent to the letter which appears in these columns, writes: "I have just sold two Lehigh Valley R. R. bonds granting that for all time the owner will receive four and a half per cent interest." That this is pure interest we have to deny.

These two Lehigh Valley R. R. bonds are bearer receipts for capital lent by Mr. Stewart to the railroad. The Lehigh Valley R. R. uses that capital in transportation services (production). There is no perpetuity in the contract that can be carried out unless the railroad is allowed its land value capitalization in perpetuity, in which case it takes more than its present bond interest out of the public.

Conversely, should the land value be taken in taxation it destroys the capitalization set-ups by the railroad. Improvement values go back to the land within thirty years, and, like any other contract, this one depends upon the ability to perform.

Perpetuity on any loan simply does not exist. The explanation why it does not is the changing character of investment, the dissolutions that follow new set-ups in industry, the mutations of ownership, and the fact that capital wastes faster than the rate of interest.

Our aim is, and Henry George's remedy will secure it, work for all, production for all, capital for all. If interest then rises it will go to the owners of capital who will then be (with poverty abolished) all the people. If it declines it makes no difference either, for it will have been absorbed as wages.—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

#### CUT TAXES AND REDUCE CARRYING CHARGES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Kindly allow me space in LAND AND FREEDOM to comment on Milo Perkins' article: "Grab the Torch—Men of Means—Grab the Torch," in *The Nation* for November 28. It is truly a call for action that Chambers of Commerce should heed; a distinct contribution toward the solution of our maladjustments. But his suggestions concerning a higher wage might, I believe, be somewhat modified by a more careful study of the limitations of price "fixing," of any kind. Wages, and the price of all commodities will seek and find their proper level, if and when statutory and other obstacles are removed. Taxation is the chief obstacle.

Recall the sensation created by Henry Ford when he first raised wages to a minimum of \$5.00 per day. It attracted the attention of many economists and sociologists. The great scientist, Dr. David Starr Jordan, made a special trip to Detroit to study the innovation and evaluate its potentialities. Mr. Ford accorded the Doctor every assistance needed to make a survey, and when it was completed he was horrified to learn that his gesture had actually lowered his employees' wages 43 cents per day. He asked Dr. Jordan why that was so and was told that the dealers in living necessities, and landlords in Detroit had raised prices and rent to absorb the rise in wages; that the law of "supply and demand" governed, and might not be ignored with impunity. High wages will buy no more goods and services at high prices than low wages will buy at low prices. The Doctor advised Mr. Ford that if he wanted to help his wage earners, he and they must get control of supplies and housing and reduce prices therefore. That is what they did, but it should have been done first. By neglecting to set the stage in the right way before the act, he hurt his own employees, and *all* consumer-workers in Detroit. He had not thought the proposition clear through before acting.

Raising wages arbitrarily, or "pegging" prices for anything does not work. It is reversing the natural order and will always do harm, as it has in the past, whenever tried. First, attack cost and squeeze out every cent of overhead that is possible. Some cost items should be eliminated entirely. Taxes are one. All adjustments made, in cost of production and distribution, are reflected in prices and wages. Take all taxes out of prices; and wages *must* rise. Herein is the law.

If carrying charges were cut fifty per cent, the present wage could buy twice as many miles of transportation; and the price of all consumers' goods would drop twenty-five to fifty per cent. Ask dealers in lumber and coal, flour and other heavy freight. The buying power

of wages, salaries and farmers' products, would rise accordingly. That is the right way to raise wages. Congress can make that adjustment in the first few days of the next session, by underwriting *all* tax levies against *all* of our carrier facilities, in exchange for a substantial cut in rates, approximately fifty per cent. That measure of relief *must* be financed by a Federal levy of one per cent on *all* land values, urban and rural, irrespective of *all* improvements. Such a tax cannot be passed on to consumers, neatly wrapped up in prices, as are all other taxes except inheritance tax. It would reduce the price of land, thus making possible new housing and slum clearance without aid or benefit of HOLC or PWA. It would also enable tenant farmers to buy back their farms. Some at least.

That step would remove two of the major obstacles to recovery: Exorbitant freight rates, and profiteering in land. It would allow the natural laws of "competition" and "supply and demand" to act freely and work wonders. Natural laws are potent and usually assert their supremacy, even above acts of Congress. Ask your readers to get busy writing their Senators and Congressmen, urging a shift of *all* taxes now levied on carrier facilities to *land values* in exchange for a fifty per cent cut in rates. This action by Congress should be early next session.

Aberdeen, S. D.

CHARLES J. LAVERY, M. D.

#### DIFFERS WITH THE EDITOR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

1. Is it really necessary to kill the Henry George Congress in order to advance other methods of propaganda?
2. Is not the field large enough and the workers few enough to permit every man to choose his own methods?
3. If your estimate of ten thousand dollars spent on the recent Congress is correct does not that prove a demand exists for the Annual Congresses?
4. If they were discontinued, do you think ten per cent of that would be used to buy scholarships?
5. Your suggestion of nation-wide local meetings on Labor Day is good but why should that depend on killing the Congress?
6. Knowing Single Taxers as you do from over half a century of intimate and unselfish work with them do you think anyone can force them to abandon their own plans and ideas to adopt yours?
7. Remembering how disorganized the movement was when the first of these Congresses was held are we not deeply indebted to Messrs. Evans, Williams and their associates for starting and continuing them?
8. Would not the work of John Lawrence Monroe and of all other workers suffer if the Congresses were discontinued?

Bolar, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

#### REPLY

To paragraph 1, the answer is no, but it seems to us imperative that we consider a somewhat different programme for these Congresses.

To paragraph 2, the question is not one of individual work, nor that of permitting every man to choose his own methods. For the Congress is cooperative work in which all should join, and this has been the aim of Secretary Williams from the beginning.

To paragraph 3, we do not think that the money spent proves anything. The Congresses may be worth while but money spent in traveling expenses does not prove it.

To paragraph 4, we can only say that we do not know.

To paragraph 5, we would say perhaps not, and to paragraph 6, we really do not know. But to paragraph 8, we think not.

To paragraph 7, we would reply that we are deeply indebted to Messrs. Williams and Evans for their splendid and devoted service in calling together these often fine and representative Congresses. But we do not recall that the movement was disorganized before

the Henry George Foundation was started, nor that we have now an entirely complete and satisfactory organization.

But this is all beside the point. There is no criticism to be made of those in control of the Henry George Foundation. Our statement was a plea for a vote to consider what might be done to improve the character of these Congresses by the elimination of much that does not belong there, and to perfect existing organization.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

#### WE MUST BE PRACTICAL

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

All science is but natural law.

Economics is a science, a natural law.

The Single Tax is a practical application of economics.

Our autos are made scientifically. We were practical in making good roads for their use and rules for safety.

What is the most practical way to put the Single Tax in operation?

Judge Ralston is practical in bringing economics in discussion by a tax amendment in California. He is showing that State the way. The importance and the practicability of the amendment is that it makes it possible for many to see what we are trying to show them.

St. Louis, Mo.

E. H. BOECK.

#### THE "PUBLIC'S" TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS MAGUIRE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Permit me to quote the following editorial entitled "Faithful Over A Few Things," which appeared in *The Public* for Jan. 14, 1916, concerning the late Francis W. Maguire:

"Early in the Single Tax movement a man joined the Chicago Single Tax Club for the purpose of aiding a cause dear to his heart. He could not make speeches, nor carry on a public debate, and he had little money to contribute. The first thing he found to do was to stand at the door, and hand out tracts to those who attended the meetings. Presently he added a few pamphlets—which he sold at cost. Then more pamphlets, and paper covered books were added, and finally a few bound books. All related to the Single Tax, and all were sold at the lowest price that would sustain his venture—without pay for himself. And so this earnest man coined his heart's enthusiasm into service for his fellows by distributing literature. Week after week he has stood behind his little stock of books, tracts, and pamphlets. If the stranger could not buy a book, a pamphlet was suggested. That failing, a tract was pressed upon him. Years have passed, the man's hair has turned white, yet still he attends every meeting of the Club, eager to supply the stranger with food for his soul, and setting high the standard of service for the many earnest working men and women in the Club. It will undoubtedly please the many people who have noted this fidelity to know that the commercial house in which he has labored in a humble capacity has recognized his faithful service by giving him a life pension. The Chicago Single Tax Club has had many zealous officers and members who have given of their time and their money; but no one has exceeded the devotion of F. W. Maguire."

What was said then could be increasingly applied as the years went on. Perhaps, it may be sufficient merely to state that on the day before he passed away, Maguire discussed with me plans to distribute more literature. In other words, he was faithful to the end, and to quote one of his favorite quotations, "with a faith that never faltered."

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. ROSE.

#### CATCHING UP WITH HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Of course you have not failed to note the report of the National Survey of Potential Product Capacity. It appears in the first

column of the front page in the *Herald-Tribune*, and I suppose is similarly featured in the other papers.

After all these years, they are beginning to catch up with the *starting-point* of Henry George so many years ago. What a heaven-sent opportunity to drive the lesson home, and to call attention to the fact that the "discovery" of the committee is simply that which "Progress and Poverty" pointed out with unerring clarity. The only difference is that Henry George was not content to verify the fact, but also analyzed the cause, and pointed out the remedy. Must it take another fifty odd years before those who have just arrived at his starting-point will learn also to follow out the problem to its only answer?

Paterson, N. J.

JAMES F. MORTON.

#### ENDORSES OUR PROPOSAL FOR A HENRY GEORGE DAY EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In my humble judgment, whatever that may be worth, the suggestion of a Henry George Day as proposed by LAND AND FREEDOM, is a most excellent one. I believe the observance of such a day by as large number as possible of local organizations, even with modest functions at first, would contribute most substantially to putting the Single Tax movement forward, and that of course is the prime desideratum with us.

The Annual Henry George Conferences are delightful and edifying to those who can attend, as they are to a much less extent to those who must be content to read about them. I am, however, quite inclined to feel as indeed I have felt for some while that they are a luxury which the movement can scarcely afford, as yet.

As I have said before, I am always reminded that at such gatherings, those in attendance enjoy a degree of sentimental satisfaction and mutual pleasure, and they extract considerable that is stimulating and helpful, but we go on milling around, holding aloft our nice, spotless banner, only no one outside those immediately concerned or participating cares a whoop about it. No impressive steps, no real stages of progress are marked. No one pays any particular attention. Not even publicity of any consequence is obtained.

With Henry George Day, luncheons, banquets or local annual gatherings, literally millions of people would at least hear something of the movement, for local newspapers are not so chary of space about reform activities which would provide publicity throughout the entire country. There would result, I believe, renewed and increased zeal and activity, and thousands would become interested. Educational opportunities would develop and out of all this certainly much good would result.

It appears to me that Labor Day would not be a desirable date to be celebrated as Henry George Day, though I admit the closely allied interest. One would detract from the other, resulting in no net gain perhaps for either. I believe Mr. George's birthday would be infinitely better. Mr. George stood for men, neither unionists nor non-unionists, neither rich nor poor, but for men and the fundamental rights for men. This is merely my thought on the matter, I do believe that such a combination would be unfortunate, that the psychology of it would be unfavorable and there would be a good deal of misinterpreting of it.

The observance of a Henry George Day, as you have proposed, would I think be a very great aid to the cause of the true economic philosophy.

Seattle, Wash.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY.

#### A WORLD CONVERTED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I agree with Frank Stephens when he expresses regret that so many in the Single Tax movement have not a knowledge of the fundamentals of our common belief. But I think also that many misjudge the relative importance of the ideas that Henry George gave to the world.

The greatest discovery set forth in "Progress and Poverty," in my opinion, is not the Single Tax but what I call The Gospel of Plenty.

George wrote at a time, as the book clearly shows, when all the world believed that poverty, even death by starvation, was the inevitable fate of many in a progressive society. The reason was very simple—the alleged rapidity of increase of population in comparison with the increase in the means of subsistence. With such belief widely accepted, it would have been foolish to prove that the Single Tax would distribute wealth more evenly, for that would only mean a diminishing ratio for everyone. Had this been George's belief he would never have written at all.

But he saw that in a progressive society plenty was not only possible but inevitable. In fact he saw that the means of wealth production in his own time had actually produced a condition of plenty. What he had to do was to destroy the false and horrible doctrines of that day and demonstrate the true science of political economy.

His very first word is a declaration of the existence of plenty—see the opening sentence and the rest of the first chapter of "Progress and Poverty." He not only declared this doctrine—which was not wholly new—but he proceeded to prove it. This he accomplished so effectively that no scientist with a reputation to lose has, since that time, squarely declared his belief in the old Malthusian doctrine.

But the world generally, including many Single Taxers, misses the second great invention of this master mind—that the product of labor is the wages of the laborer. This wholly upsets a doctrine which, in some form prevails everywhere today—that wages and subsistence of the laborer are paid out of capital.

Then came the third discovery—the Single Tax, which is a simple and practical means to assure to the laborer access to materials and practically guarantees him power to keep his product as his wages.

Many of George's followers accept the idea of plenty as axiomatic, or, rather, as trite. They fail to see it in its proper relation as the bedrock foundation of George's system. Thus, they misunderstand, or perhaps ignore, the second discovery, the law of wages. They therefore arrive at the Single Tax which they use only as a working tool of propaganda. Their ignorance of the science innate in the tool prevents them from using it to advantage.

Here we have a whole world of people who accept—whether understandingly or not—the basic doctrine of Henry George, the doctrine that in a progressive society there is plenty for all. But there is no one to show them that this plenty for all is only the first step toward truth. The second step is that everyone must have a job, which is nothing but freedom to apply labor to materials, and the right to take the product as wages. Then—third and final step—access to materials and right of absolute property in product is assured by the Single Tax. There is an added step in practice and necessarily covered by the above theory—that laborers of all kinds must be free to exchange what they produce. This is the way to translate plenty for all into plenty for each.

All this seems to me so plain, so vital, that I give all my time to making it known. I believe that to preach the Single Tax is to begin at the wrong end. For one thing, we lose the advantage which we have every right to claim—the rights of discovery in the great new fact of plenty. Instead of regretting so much the scarcity of our numbers as Single Taxers, let us declare our world conquest as preachers of our Prophet's faith in overflowing and assured abundance! Let us make it known to all the world that the same principle of justice the operation of which has produced this miracle of abundance, if trusted, will distribute abundance to every human creature.

Ottawa, Canada.

A. C. CAMPBELL.

#### HENRY FORD AND HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have just finished reading "Henry George and Henry Ford" by Charles O'Connor Hennessy.



I have noticed this resemblance mentioned in the article before. The first time was when I was reading an article by Ford in the *Liberty* magazine a few months ago. I no longer have the copy and can not remember the exact words, but one of the sentences was to the effect that in the future we may devise a tax system that will eliminate depressions and solve our unemployment problem.

The sentence came as a surprise to me, but since I have reviewed Ford's ideas I see that they do not conflict in any particular that I can find with George's.

Georgetown, Ill.

ALVIN TESTOR.

### THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR AND LAND AND FREEDOM:

I write this note so that the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM may be brought up to date on the California situation.

It will be recalled that a sufficient number of signatures were procured to secure the presentation under the initiative to the voters of California of a constitutional amendment which would cancel recent sales taxes, prohibit their future imposition, and transfer within a period of five years all taxation upon improvements and tangible personal property to land values. This amendment may be brought before the people of California at a special election which the Governor of California may direct to be called, or in default of such direction, must be presented to them at the general election in 1936.

The present unsettled question is, at which election the amendment will be voted upon. If Upton Sinclair had been elected governor, there would have been little doubt that the amendment would have come before the people probably in June or July of the present year. Merriam, however, was elected. His general attitude has been hostile to the amendment, and it seems now fair to believe that he will not order it to a special election but that the contest will be deferred until November, 1936. The delay is not in all respects unfortunate. We have an extended opportunity in which to carry on the discussion and familiarize the people of the State with our ideas. In addition, certain immediately pressing questions as to the present State deficit will be cleared up and the issue simplified. From all this we shall expect in the end to be the gainers.

Meanwhile, we are gratified to note that one reason why our statesmen at the capitol at Sacramento entertain manifestly a wholesome fear of what the result will be when the amendment comes up to be voted upon by the people. They are therefore disposed to postpone as far as possible what to them seems to be the evil day.

I cannot refrain from once more calling the attention of all sympathizers in the country to the fact that this election will be the most important one, as well as the most promising, so far in the whole history of our movement, and to urge upon them that they do everything in their power to further its success. Their influence in the work they may be able to do in California, although they are beyond its jurisdiction, can be made to start effectively upon the final result.

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

### ABOUT BEING SAVED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The comments on the Henry George Congress by the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM meet with my enthusiastic approval. I attended the previous Chicago Congress and at about the close of the meeting, stated from the floor that I had no interest in attending meetings whose members devoted most of their time to reading Single Tax papers to each other, and to the discussion of Old Age Pensions, Unemployment Insurance, Money and other social questions, important as they may be.

In my opinion there is only one reason for a Henry George organization and that is to make practical plans to promote his idea until it becomes a realized social fact.

Single Taxers are not as dumb as Mr. Frank Stephens would have

us believe, and it appears to me that lack of progress is due to the fact that so many of us are really following the suggestions of Mr. Stephens and debating with anyone on any subject. It is difficult to become a Single Taxer without doing a little thinking and like those who acquire wealth quickly we just automatically know everything.

We should of course, try to keep reasonably informed on all public questions, but having made up our minds to what we want it is suicidal to let anything divert us. But Single Taxers chase every social rainbow, municipal and state ownership, proportional representation, money, old age pensions, unemployment insurance and what have you—all good—all desirable. Did you, however, follow the courses of the women who wanted to vote and the prohibitionists who wanted a dry earth? Did you know any of them debating birth control or the Einstein theory with all comers? You did not. These groups knew what they wanted and as they say in golf, they swung on the ball and "followed through."

After one becomes a Single Taxer, there are just two questions:

1. How to get Single Tax?  
after which

2. How to apply Single Tax?

The country is full of individuals and little groups scattering little seeds from hell to Wisconsin and back again and collectively have they raised a garden? They have not; not even a hill of beans. Gardens are not raised that way. When it is desired to raise a garden, a spot is prepared, seeds are planted and that spot is weeded and cultivated.

I believe it possible for us to really make a successful garden if the Single Taxers of the country will select some State, any State, as the "spot" and then give that spot everything WE'VE got in money, energy and thought. It might take ten or fifteen years or more to really produce results, but what of that? Isn't it better to look forward to possible success in twenty years rather than to wander along for another fifty years and get nowhere?

In connection with how to apply Single Tax, it's simply impossible to understand Mr. Stephens, as this question was answered hundreds of years ago. I don't know when, and it's answered thousands of times every day; it's answered every time a landlord and tenant agree on a lease. Everytime a ninety-nine year lease is made for a new office building, the tenant agrees to pay the specified annual rent for the use of the particular "site" to be used, and the abolition of taxes and the collection of land value rentals by society is as simple as that.

There really isn't very much excuse for an old timer in Single Tax to answer the question "How shall we assess the rental value of land where collection of economic rent has ended selling values?" by saying, "Let us be elected first and we'll find out what to do about it afterwards."

The questioner answers his own question if he would but consider this part of it "when collection of economic rent has ended selling values."

When the State has collected economic rent that has ended selling values, that is Single Tax, and why ask any question concerning how to do something already done. It is surprising that a practically minded S. T. like Mr. Stephens should be thus caught in a maze of his own making.

What we need is what the women Suffragists needed, voters. The way to get Single Tax voters is to teach people about Single Tax. They can understand Single Tax and they can't understand these other things which apparently no one understands, and they don't care anything about them anyway.

People can understand "A steady job and increased purchasing power." That's our gospel and our text; let's stick to it. You may have all the intellectuals who can discuss money intelligently and disagree about it, but as for me, I should like to help cultivate a "spot" where a Single Tax garden will be the desired end. Let's abandon our narrow, localized ideas and agree on a "spot." I'd

work as hard and do as much for California, New Jersey or Delaware as for Michigan if we were all agreed, but the idea of filling a gun with bird shot and shooting straight up in the air never did appeal to me. Some day this kind of shooting might get a bird, but?

Detroit, Mich.

A. LAWRENCE SMITH.

### SAVING THE LANDED INTERESTS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is interesting to note that so many young men who are active in the "New Deal" so-called, are large holders of valuable real estate—Vincent Astor, A. Averill Harriman, William H. Vanderbilt, Henry Morgenthau, Sr. and Jr., Lew Douglas, etc., etc.

Here as in England, the landed interests are willing to try almost any new experiment even though it uses up half of their income so long as it does not in any way endanger the security of large land holders. Perhaps this is not done consciously; but sub-consciously or unconsciously these men are certainly looking for their own interest. Even the men upon whom it would seem we ought to rely are wandering off after strange gods.

The Single Tax is the most radical and at the same time the most conservative of all reforms. It is in line with American thought and traditions; leaves rugged individualism a permanent factor in American civilization as it has been in the past; believes in and advocates individual initiative and the right of the individual to keep his own earnings and to transfer them to his children; and at the same time it will accomplish everything that the New Deal is trying to accomplish without all this complicated mix-up and hubbub which has put the average business man in a position where he does not dare to make a move for fear it may be the wrong one.

I was extremely sorry to hear of the death of Oscar Geiger. Our movement has been fortunate in attracting men who have been willing to sacrifice themselves for the cause.

Fort Atkinson, Wisc.

CHAS. B. ROGERS.

### ALL SINGLE TAXERS WILL NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It was only after I had read Mr. Luxton's comments that I gave serious consideration to the article by Mr. Stephens in the Nov.-Dec. number of LAND AND FREEDOM.

I. Mr. Stephens quotes Socrates, "The beginning of wisdom is the definition of terms," and regrets that no one of five well-known Single Taxers could define Wealth, Money, Interest, Utility, Value in terms that the majority would accept. Mr. Luxton's comment is, "When one considers that man is a biological entity the fact that not one of five prominent Single Taxers could agree upon certain definitions is not to be wondered at. Mr. Stephens expects too much of the human race."

In the same paper, however, Mr. Luxton complains of communists and socialists on the ground that they "change the meanings of terms many times in a single discussion" and asks, "How on earth can one convince such folk?" Moreover in Mr. Luxton's argument on money and interest I find little of anything more than an insistence on the definition of the terms. He concludes with another reference to communists and socialists, "We should not permit them to stray from the field when discussing these topics." How stray from the field? I ask. The answer comes in Mr. Luxton's own words. They "change the meaning of terms many times in a single discussion?"

I find myself in hearty agreement with Mr. Stephens as to the need for accuracy in the definition of such terms as he gave. Personally I shall hold myself more strictly to account than I shall those with whom I disagree. Accuracy of definition is fully as important for thinking as it is for arguing.

II. I find myself also in sympathy with Mr. Stephens in his feeling that if President Roosevelt had Single Taxers in his brain trust

they would find great difficulty in advising him. But immediately I have to part company with him, for if they did not pass out of the picture almost immediately, I believe they would find themselves in the category to which Mr. Stephens assigns Champ Clark, William J. Bryan, Ramsey McDonald, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, and Newton Baker. In passing I must be pardoned for saying that I do not like the tone of voice in which I picture Mr. Stephens assigns these gentlemen to their class.

III. I am greatly surprised, however, at the assumption that land will have no selling value under the pure Single Tax. Mr. Stephens makes the assumption and Mr. Luxton says that all Single Taxers are agreed as to that. I am not in agreement, and I claim to be a Single Taxer.

In support of my position I quote from "Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II, about a page from the end.

"When the common right to land is so far appreciated that all taxes are abolished save those which fall upon rent, there is no danger of much more than is necessary to induce them to collect the public revenues being left to individual landholders."

In this Henry George at least recognized the possibility of something being left to the landholder in the nature of selling value. I am of those who believe that he thought this to be desirable as well as possible. I believe he meant exactly what he said when he said, "Let them buy and sell, bequeath and devise." Land should be worth at least enough to bring in a year's taxes in case of refusal to pay.

I am not so rash as to predict the conditions that will obtain under the full Single Tax. At the same time I do indulge in speculation and imagination as to what will come to pass. I believe that most, perhaps all, Single Taxers hold that the private and individual possession of land is a necessary condition for the highest civilization. I want to suggest the possibility at least that the retention of a selling value to land may be a necessary cog in the social machinery to render to the individual the things that are the individual's and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's.

Chicago, Ill.

HIRAM B. LOOMIS.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

E. H. BOECK of St. Louis writes: "Your comment in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM points out how impractical it is to have these annual gatherings of Single Taxers when the money they cost could be spent in more practical ways." James B. Ellery of Gloucester, Mass., comments as follows: "I agree with you fully in what you say regarding the Henry George Congresses. Does the money they cost advance the cause as a whole?" E. W. Doty of Cleveland also endorses our opinion, and says: "Some of the papers belonged to a chamber of commerce or rotary meeting. Some of our Single Taxers need to be taught what the Single Tax is and what it is not, especially what it is not."

M. V. WATROS, a new subscriber from Fairhope, Ala., writes: "I knew Henry George well. My most treasured possession is a copy of 'Protection or Free Trade' which was presented to me by Henry George himself."

CHARLES G. MERRELL of Cincinnati, O., has an interesting letter in the *Cincinnati Post* and draws the editor's fire who says partly in reply: "Now that all land has been taken up, there are some who contend dolorously that the passing of the frontier has taken with it the opportunity of individual advancement; that American progress must necessarily slow up." And hasn't it.

THE Henry George League of New Jersey held a largely attended dinner on the evening of December 6, in the Down Town Club of Newark. About 150 were present. Dr. John Dewey, while chiding

midly the attitude of Single Taxers, made an earnest appeal for the consideration of Henry George's teachings. Anna George de Mille, F. C. Leubuscher, and others spoke, Mr. Leubuscher replying to Dr. Dewey's gentle chiding of Single Taxers for not "diversifying their propaganda," quoted from Dr. Dewey's radio address in which the distinguished teacher said: "I do not claim that George's remedy will cure by itself all our ailments. But I do claim that we cannot get rid of our basic troubles without it." The dinner was voted a great success.

WE regret to learn from one of our Australian cotemporaries of the death of E. C. Fletcher of Ularunda, Queensland, long a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM. With his brother he carried on business as a drover in a big way. He was born in Tasmania but finally settled in Queensland. The Brisbane *Courier-Mail* says of him, "The State can ill afford to lose men of the type of E. C. Fletcher."

LOUIS F. WESTON of Cambridge, Mass., writes: "I agree with John Luxton on his comment on Frank Stephen's article, yet with all respect to Mr. Stephens for the splendid work he has done for the cause. To use an old simile, I feel that he is standing so close to a tree that he does not see the forest."

"LIKELY to do more good for the cause than any suggestion yet made is yours in last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM for a Henry George Day observed in all cities and many villages simultaneously. This would attract attention and this is what the movement lacks," writes Lewis H. Clark of Sodus, N. Y.

PAUL McCOMBS of Austin, Texas, believes that State is ripe for a Single Tax experiment, and he has lived 78 years there.

GEORGE DANA LINN has an admirable article on the first page of the Seattle (Wash.) *Municipal News*.

It is not at all surprising that Otto Cullman's "Twenty Million Dollars Every Day" has aroused much favorable comment throughout the country from men of affairs. Business men especially have been attracted to it.

OUR old friend James F. Morton, of Paterson, N. J., evidently subscribes to the conviction rather widely held that a conspiracy of silence prevails in the press of the country regarding our doctrines. The *Newark Call* failed to print a letter of Mr. Morton's. This was followed by similar action on the part of the *Herald-Tribune*. He points out that the *Literary Digest* "has abandoned its old policy of neutrality and now takes distinct sides of many questions. It does, however, admit correspondence on all of these, except the Single Tax." Perhaps if we made news the papers would print it. It may be said in extenuation that both the *Herald-Tribune* and the *New York Post* printed recently admirable Single Tax letters from E. B. Swinney.

DR. F. MASON PADELFORD, of Fall River, Mass., has issued a new and revised edition of his *Economics of Democracy*, 29 pages and cover. Send ten cents for a copy to Dr. Padelford.

SATURDAY and Sunday, Nov. 24 and 25, were made the occasions of a reception at the Henry George School for the friends and students with the Director and Trustees. The hostesses who supplied refreshments to the visitors were Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Mrs. Fowles, Mrs. Recker, Miss Denbigh, Mrs. Burger and Mrs. Luxton. Both occasions brought forth a large attendance.

THE American Association for Scientific Taxation gave a luncheon at the Hotel Parkside, Gramercy Park, on Nov. 20 in this city and

discussed with one or two of the city officials the effect of land values on city rebuilding.

HENRY WARE ALLEN has just completed the manuscript of a new book which is to be entitled "Prosperity—By the Single Tax." We shall await its appearance with interest.

JAMES B. ELLERY spoke before a representative audience at Gloucester, Mass., in December. The Gloucester *Daily Times* said, "Following his talk great appreciation was expressed for his excellent presentation."

*Progress* of Melbourne, Australia, gives a very good review of Otto Cullman's "Twenty Million Dollars Every Day."

OSWALD SCHLOCKOW, of Brooklyn, a noted educator and one of the District Superintendents of New York City's Department of Education, has written to John Luxton: "Please accept appreciation of your fine article in defense of democracy in the columns of the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In these days when every theory of government is preached from pulpit and platform except good old fashioned democracy a contribution like yours makes the heart beat faster. May you find many imitators."

To the *Herald-Tribune* of Dec. 20, Walter Lippman contributes an article which is entitled "Back to First Principles." It is an analysis of the vote given by cotton growers in favor of crop control. He also properly characterizes this policy. This article justifies what we have said of Mr. Lippman on another page (under Comment and Reflection) as being right "once in four times." Hats off to Mr. Lippman on this one occasion!

AN important bill will be introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature affecting existing forest land conservation. This is being backed by the New England Conservation Association.

JOHN F. CONROY of 56 Murdock Street, Youngstown, O., runs a weekly column in the *Journal of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers of North America*, the organization that is trying to unionize the plants of the U. S. Steel Corporation with the aid of the NRA. Mr. Conroy gets more Single Tax in his column than anything else. He knows the real remedy and is trying to make the steel workers see it.

THE Christmas number of *The Listener*, an attractive popular periodical published in London, contains an advertisement of "Progress and Poverty" headed "Poverty in Plenty."

A. C. Campbell of Ottawa, Canada, occupies three pages of the Christmas number of the *Canadian Unionist* in which he further reinforces his doctrine of the Gospel of Plenty.

To be catalogued among prevailing insanities is the Townsend Plan which proposes to pension off every individual over sixty at the rate of \$200 a month. While in receipt of this pension no one of the recipients shall engage in any gainful activity. The author of this Bedlamite plan is reputed to be a fine Christian gentleman. He may be all that, but he needs a little elementary education.

CAN any of our readers help us to locate a little pamphlet on fundamental economics said to have been written by a daughter of Harriet Beecher Stowe, and which opens with a pen picture of a primitive man digging clams on the beach who has fashioned a stick to help him dig—thus representing land, labor and capital?

HENRY B. MAURER, of Cranford, N. J., is about to issue an anthology, mainly of radical verse. Among the selections will be "The Calf Path," by Sam Walter Foss, "Sedition," by Edmund Vance Cooke, "An Ancient Wrong," by Samuel Brazier, "The Bread Line," by Joseph Dana Miller, and many others. In the same volume will be a poem addressed to the President and the latter's gracious acknowledgment.

A RECENT report on the agrarian situation emanating from the government of Mexico states that only one tenth of the land of Mexico is in use.

G. J. KNAPP informs us that the amendment to the Denver charter which was semi-Single Tax was defeated in the election of Nov. 6 by 15,000 votes, so that a change of 7,500 votes would carry it. Another amendment sponsored by the real estate interests was defeated by two to one.

MRS. BESSIE BEACH TRUEHART, of Houston, Texas, informs us of the death of John R. Spencer at the age of 88, a resident for many years of the Union Printer's Home in Colorado Springs, Colo. He passed away peacefully in his sleep. He was prominent for many years in the Union Labor movement and was a staunch Henry George advocate associated with such leaders of the movement as George N. Beach and A. Freeland. "Uncle John," as he was affectionately known, was born in Canton, Ill., and was engaged in the newspaper business. He succeeded the famous Josh Billings as publisher of the Crawford (Texas) *Yeoman* and served as postmaster of Crawford from 1884 to 1888. The Single Tax movement in Texas, particularly, owes much to John R. Spencer as originator and speaker and for the inspiration he gave to younger workers in the cause.

SENATOR STOCKWELL of the Minnesota legislature will introduce a Single Tax bill. According to information the constitution of that State permits the enactment of a Single Tax measure.

"I AM feeling great satisfaction for the many fold return you give for a small subscription payment," writes a new subscriber, F. J. Fee, of Philadelphia.

JOSEPH R. CARROLL, of Norfolk, Conn., has a long letter on the thirty hour week in the *Hartford Courant*. He says in part:

The New Deal notion that industry can pay the same money wages for a short work week as for a longer one, is based evidently upon a lack of knowledge of the real nature of the phenomenon called wages. This is especially noticeable in the process called "priming the pump," which in realty amounts to putting a monkey wrench in the pump. It evidently accepts the mediaeval fallacy that wages are derived from a pre-existing wage fund, whereas, as Henry George showed in his "Progress and Poverty," the real cause of wages is useful and effective exertion on the part of the worker.

The longer and more effectively a given worker or group works, the more opportunity for employment there will be for the remainder of the people.

FLORENCE GARVIN, daughter of the late Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, writes us: "The proposal of Dr. Lavery is very good and should be introduced in the coming Congress. What Dr. Lavery says about the railroads is the voice of forgotten wisdom."

"LAND AND FREEDOM is the finest publication of its kind," writes John W. Keegan, of Forestville, Ill.

DR. JOHN DEWEY, president of the People's Lobby at Washington, and president of the Henry George School of Social Science, said recently at a conference: "Take the measures of the New Deal. You will not find one that is not compromised, prejudiced—yes, nullified—by private monopolization of natural opportunity."

WE have received an interesting letter from Clayton J. Ewing. He left on Jan. 20 for a trip south, and expects to visit Jackson, Miss., New Orleans, Fairhope, and St. Petersburg, Fla. He says: "Many did not appraise Oscar Geiger while living at his real worth. He is more generally recognized now. How great a work he did in founding the School! I first saw him at the New York convention which was the first time I met the great leaders of the movement. I was enraptured at his wonderful oration delivered there, "Natural Law in the Economic World."

THE *World-Herald* of Omaha says editorially: "The Henry George Club is going to discuss taxes and eventually all tax clubs get around to discussing Henry George." The Club met recently and listened to Dr. M. D. Crossett of Lincoln and Henry F. Sarman of Omaha.

CHAS. G. MERRELL writes to the editor of the *Cincinnati Post*:

Land is a heritage to all the children of men from the Creator of the universe and should not be held out of use by any individual, as against those who wish to use it. This could all be accomplished by absorbing the rental value of land into the Government coffers and relieving our people of all other taxation. We would not then be fined, or taxed, for putting up new homes or improving old ones; nor would we be punished by being taxed on industry and thrift, which ought to be encouraged.

This one revision of the tax laws would do more to cure the depression and to prevent others than any other one thing that we could do. It is of course not a universal panacea but it is a fundamental one without which all other procedures are in vain.

More and more men are coming to see this principle enunciated by Henry George fifty years ago, and it is hoped that the day will arrive before long when enough will see the justice of this remedy to put it into effect.

In a recent issue of the *Toronto University Quarterly* is an article by Prof. Frank H. Knight, professor of political economy at the University of Chicago. It is entitled "Social Science and the Political Trend." With some of the conclusions we might disagree but are glad to quote approvingly the following: "A genuine religious conversion would be necessary for most all the members of any group which should really devote itself to a love of truth and faith in truth." The whole article is singularly thoughtful.

THERE is a rumor that Huey Long will come to Pittsburgh to debate with Mayor McNair. It is said that Senator Long is considering it. An admission fee would be charged, the proceeds to go to unemployment relief.

FRANK H. HOWE, of Columbus, O., sends us an interesting item of news. The Archeological and Historical Museum of that city has acquired a bound volume of *The Radical* published by George Henry Evans, one of our early land reformers, living in Granville, N. J. He was a printer and came from England. In Granville he edited *The Radical* in 1841. George White of Long Branch was the original discoverer of Evans and an account of his life and work appeared in LAND AND FREEDOM. That this volume should have turned up in Columbus is curious. Mr. Evans said in one issue of his paper: "My doctrine is this: the use of land is the equal natural right of all citizens of this and future generations, and therefore that the land should not be a matter of traffic, gift or will. In other words, that the land is not property, and therefore should not be transferable like the products of man's labor."

SAM EWING is correspondent of the *San Francisco News*. He is a newspaper man of wide experience. He quotes from a letter of a friend, Juan Fernandez, a Chilean lawyer, who tells of a building boom in the city of Santiago, Chile, due to a ten years exemption of all buildings in that city. Fully fifteen thousand artisans are being given steady work and whole sections of the city are being built over. This is true of many residences and retail and wholesale stores. New

York can furnish Chile with some interesting and valuable statistics resulting from a similar experiment, of which some of the citizens of Santiago are doubtless informed.

THE *Gazette* of Phoenix, Ariz., prints in its issue of Jan. 7, an editorial under the heading "Depression Forty Years Ago," and makes liberal quotations from Henry George. Some of our readers may recall that a statue of "Bucky" O'Neil, once mayor of Phoenix, adorns the public square. O'Neil was killed at San Juan Hill in the Spanish-American war. We knew him well. He tried to make Phoenix a Single Tax city and nearly succeeded.

UNDER the heading "Waldauer is Back" the *Memphis Press-Scimitar* welcomes Hon. Abe D. Waldauer, who is now back in the City Hall in his old position as first assistant City Attorney.

THE *New York Times'* special correspondent from San Francisco says: "The governor and his advisers fear that the Single Tax scheme will be adopted because of its being linked with repeal of the unpopular sales tax."

THE *Researcher*, an eight page mimeographed paper, is a product of the younger pupils of the Henry George School of New York. This is to be published monthly and is to be credited to Robert Clancy, Robert Black, Max Berkowitz and Miss Edith Salkay.

*Reynolds Weekly* of London, with a circulation of nearly half a million, and probably read by a million, has an article prominently displayed in its issue of Dec. 16, by J. W. Graham Peace, entitled "Behind the Scenes it is the Land That Always Counts." It is written with his usual vigor of expression. Our congratulations!

"LAND Prices in a Commodity Price System" is a sixteen page pamphlet by Philip H. Cornick, reprinted from a recent issue of the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*. We hope to give a more extended notice in a future issue. Mr. Cornick is a member of the Schalkenbach Foundation and for many years an active Single Taxer.

A SOUND and scholarly statement of our principles appears in the November issue of *The Tax Magazine* of Chicago from Raymond V. McNally. It is a rebuttal of Dr. Edwin S. Todd's article in a previous issue of that magazine. Needless to say that like everything Mr. McNally writes it is clear and forcibly stated.

*democracy* (with a small "d") is a "journal of fundamental democracy" edited by Charles H. Ingersoll. Write to the Manhattan Single Tax Club, 1165 Broadway for a sample copy.

GEORGE T. TIDEMAN of Chicago writes: "I still believe in holding conventions. I am convinced that the money so spent would be spent anyway and probably not for Single Tax purposes."

EDWIN L. UPP of McKeesport, Pa., writes: "LAND AND FREEDOM furnishes me with more sound thought than any periodical to which I subscribe. When I have read it I circulate it among a large circle of my friends some of whom at least are beginning to see the necessity for the application of our philosophy to end the depression."

A RECENT monograph by Rosina K. Mohaupt and Alger W. Lane, published by the Research Committee of Wayne University, is entitled "A Description of the English System for the Taxation of Real Property." The authors say:

"Naturally, all vacant land is exempt from taxes . . . although this exemption of vacant property is the crux of the whole system of taxation, it has not worked out satisfactorily in England," con-

clude the authors. "It is generally conceded that it has produced the large slum areas and congested housing, and has forced the central government into large public housing projects. The owner of the land finds no necessity to develop it—he is holding it tax free."

A SERIES of articles on the economic problem is appearing in the *Coshocton (O.) Daily Tribune*, once edited by our old friend Fred S. Wallace and now worthily carried on by his son Robert S. Wallace.

Mayor McNair has appointed Hugo W. Noren, well known Pittsburgh Single Taxer, as a member of the City Board of Assessors, succeeding John J. Murray, who was recently advanced to the position as Director of the Department of Supplies.

Mr. Noren has been a Director of the Henry George Foundation since its inception and was formerly editor of the *Greenfield Bulletin* and has been for many years an active writer and worker in the Single Tax movement.

J. F. COLBERT of Minden, La., writes:

Allow me to make this suggestion, as I did three years ago in a letter to Mr. Percy R. Williams before the meeting of the 6th Congress in Baltimore: Have the national gatherings on the steps of the capitol at Washington. And for this year I suggest it be held in the summer, while Congress is in session, and attempt to get the attention of the country by getting members of Congress to attend and participate in the discussions.

I think, also, that a big school to teach economics should be established in Washington for I believe the best way to get notice throughout the country is to concentrate activities on Washington as much as possible.

I am offering these suggestions for what they may be worth.

I regret to report the death on the 8th inst., at Opelousas, La., of George K. Perrault, member of the Louisiana legislature, serving his third term of eleven years, aged 36, leader of the minority in opposition to Huey P. Long and caucus nominee for speaker when attempt was made last May to reorganize the legislature. He was a convert of the Henry George philosophy through my lending him "Progress and Poverty," and had a brilliant mind and magnetic personality. Formerly subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM, which I had sent to him.

I have been writing some articles for the two local weekly papers recently, and some interest is being manifested by a few readers. The class in civics in the Minden High School has been taking some note of them, I am informed.

EVERYONE who believes in the natural right of labor to use land should read "The Great Bootleg Coal Industry," published in *The Nation* of Jan. 9. Business in the anthracite coal industry has been slack for many years. The owners of coal lands have been getting out the reduced product with less labor, and even as far back as 1920 equipment became so efficient that additional thousands were thrown out of work. Since that time the unemployed miners have been digging coal from the outcroppings and selling it or exchanging it to pay their living expenses. This practice showed a marked increase during the strike of 1925 and a further increase since, assuming large proportions following the depression of 1929. At this date "bootleg" coal is being dug over a territory of 500 miles, in or near thirty cities and towns of the coal region, keeping directly employed one hundred thousand men and boys, and dependants, who otherwise would have to be supported by public relief. This "bootleg" industry has paid taxes and enabled families to remain in their communities. Indirectly it has been the means of keeping other thousands employed, including truckmen and transportation industries. The amount involved in 1933 is estimated as between thirty and thirty-five million dollars and in 1934 as between forty and forty-five millions, sold and distributed over at least five states.

It will interest the reader to reflect what it will mean to break up this industry and its effect politically. He will be interested in the attitude of the state authorities and of the church. He will be interested in the suggestion that the coal mines be nationalized and may ask why go to such trouble? Why not tax the lands into use? But what is demonstrated is that men will make their living if permitted access to the earth.

IT'S EASY FOR YOU TO

# Start a Class

IN

## “Progress and Poverty” Later, Build a School

That's the sure-fire way to make Single Taxers.

You learned the Single Tax by studying this great book. Help others get the truth in the same way. Get some of your friends—three, six or a dozen—to agree to read regularly assigned portions of the book, and to meet once a week at your home or office to discuss what they have read. You can direct the discussion easily and properly with a

### Teacher's Manual

This valuable book was compiled by the late Oscar H. Geiger in his work of teaching “Progress and Poverty.” It is the result of years of painstaking study—also of practical application to class room work. With this Manual—containing 263 questions and answers, suggestions on how to conduct discussions, regular reading assignments, illustrative charts—you can easily conduct your class through the eight lessons to a complete understanding of the message of Henry George. You will enjoy it and you will be doing something real in advancing the cause. Your friends will appreciate the knowledge.

**The Price -- \$1.00**

Organize your group—send for your Manual and start spreading the light **Now!**

As long as they last these Manuals will be supplied by the

**Henry George School of Social Science**

Extension Course Department

211 West 79th Street

New York

## WHY NOT MAKE A PRESENT

to the Library of your Alma Mater (High School or College) of the following books at the prices named:

**\$1.00** *Land and Liberty*, (one year)  
London, England

**\$2.00** LAND AND FREEDOM, (one year)  
with  
*Progress and Poverty* or *Social Problems*

**\$2.50** *The Philosophy of Henry George*  
By Prof. George Raymond Geiger

**\$10.00** to include the following:  
*The Philosophy of Henry George*  
LAND AND FREEDOM (one year) with  
*Progress and Poverty* or *Social Problems*,

*Land and Liberty* (one year)

*No Taxes*, (one year)

*Significant Paragraphs, Protection or Free Trade*

*The Great Robbery*, and the

*Life of Henry George*

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

New York City

## Free Tracts

THE HENRY GEORGE SOCIETY  
solicits your contribution for aiding in the free  
distribution of Henry George Tracts.

We place tracts wherever there is a demand.

You can help pay for the paper and postage.

We do the work free.

Send for samples.

C. LeBARON GOELLER  
Box 105, Endwell, N. Y.

HOUSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY  
HOUSTON, TEXAS

VOL. XXXV No. 2

WHOLE No. 189

March—April, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

Another Perplexed Philosopher

Walter Fairchild

The Gold Clause Muddle

Raymond V. McNally

On the March With John Lawrence Monroe

Reports of Activities—Correspondence

News Notes and Personals

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress  
Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 170 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

---

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

---

## MARCH—APRIL, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 2 WHOLE No. 189

---

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,  
Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

---

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	43
ANOTHER PERPLEXED PHILOSOPHER ... Walter Fairchild	46
PITTSBURGH PROGRESSING IN ECONOMIC EDUCATION	49
REPORT OF THE ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION..... Antoinette Kaufmann	50
ACTIVITIES OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB .....Chas. S. Prizer	51
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE...	53
THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL.....N. C. B. Fowles	55
THE GOLD CLAUSE MUDDLE.....Raymond V. McNally	57
MISCELLANY.....	62
CORRESPONDENCE.....	31
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	36

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

MARCH—APRIL, 1935

No. 2

## Comment and Reflection

WE are constantly invited to consider the Roosevelt political economy with reference to his intentions and to cultivate a kindlier spirit toward his philosophy. We would do so willingly if certain factors in any rational set-up were not, as it seems to us, deliberately omitted. A planned economy is conceivable if all existing factors were included. But in the Roosevelt programme these are omitted. Away in the background somewhere hidden is the factor of *land* which does not appear in all the welter of economic and social planning. Its relation to wages and production is nowhere indicated. That wealth is produced by labor from land is an obvious generalization, but it seems never to have occurred to him. Indeed it is expressly negated in his talk of money and prices. It is not denied—that of course would be too obviously absurd—but it is completely ignored.

AND because it is ignored the President falls into errors which the youngest pupil in the Henry George School would be able to correct. Lately he has been reported as saying that prices are yet too low. This was denied but we know that it has been his belief for a long time. The NRA codes sought to raise prices and his devaluation of the dollar was directed to the same end. He is troubled with what Raymond V. McNally calls "the price complex." He does not seem to know that wages are not paid for in "pieces of eight," or paper printed by the U. S. Treasury Department, but in shoes, suits of clothes, barrels of flour and bushels of potatoes. Hence his almost exclusive concern with matters of money and price.

THE same curious obtuseness with regard to wages follows as a matter of course. He started out with codes to regulate wages. He seems not to know that wages are something that cannot be regulated. He is as naive as a child about it. In a letter to Senator Glass he said: "As you are aware (Senator Glass is not aware at all!) the operation of collective bargaining, plus the operation of the national recovery act, have with the majority of organized and unorganized labor, either raised wages, or prevented any reduction in wages."

COLLECTIVE bargaining may raise wages in certain industries but can have no effect whatever upon the general level of wages. Nor can government itself raise wages, for wages are not determined that way. Roosevelt's faith in the Federal Government to raise wages or keep them from falling is extended with the same simple child-like adoration to State Governments, for he writes in this same letter to Senator Glass, while denying that the payment of wages to those now on the relief rolls may result "under some theory, in a lowering of wages by private employers:" "I say this because it is an obvious fact—first that the Federal Government and every State Government will act to prevent reductions, and secondly because public opinion throughout the country will not sustain reductions."

ROOSEVELT repeats: "I have faith enough to believe that practically one hundred per cent of employers have patriotism enough to prevent the lowering of wages." Now employers are neither philanthropists nor fools. They are business men. Mr. Roosevelt is asking them either to dig down into their private pockets or to commit business suicide. And if they are as patriotic as can be, or as considerate as may be, how can they prevent the lowering of wages? Does the President really know what he is talking about? Does he still think, despite abundant disproof, that wages are drawn from capital, or in this case from the private resources of the employer? Note that he considers that one hundred per cent of the employers of the country have it in their power to prevent the lowering of wages. Did we ever have a President before who believed this? It is difficult to credit that even Mr. Roosevelt believes it.

IT will surprise the President to be told that neither the Federal Government, nor the State Governments, nor public opinion, have any effect upon wages, or any power to keep them from falling. Wages are dependent upon men bidding for jobs, and are therefore at the mercy of men out of work. If wages could be legislatively determined the question of low or insufficient wages would have been settled long ago. And as a matter of fact such regulation has been tried by kings, parliaments and congresses from the beginning of history. And always they have failed. If Mr. Roosevelt were as well informed

as he is supposed to be (popular superstition credits him with a knowledge of history) he would know that this is so. But apparently he does not.

**J**UST now we are all living on a lower standard. Wages are lower than in 1926, a favorite year with Mr. Roosevelt, when we were neither in a boom or depression period, which means that they are lower than they have ever been. The NRA has accomplished nothing. We are face to face with the fact that Federal action has failed to keep up wages, which no reasoning man has ever thought possible anyhow.

**Y**ET in a sense government may indeed raise wages. It may do this, not by regulating them, but by opening up natural opportunities, by declaring a free earth. "They have denied you a place to work; land is a place to work," says Henry J. Foley in Jan.-Feb. LAND AND FREEDOM. Take down the fences that bar men from employment. Every able bodied man, with every tool we call capital, will rush in when land is opened to labor. They always did. Read of the opening of Oklahoma, go further back and read of the settlement of new countries, this great country, Australia, New Zealand. And for the further benefit of our socialist friends note how little was required of capital. Mighty little they had of it, but they made it, turning prairies into cities, desolate places into imperial markets and congeries of great factories. They planted in the sparsely settled West millions of acres of life-giving wheat and corn; they did what they can do again.

**T**HERE is no lack of land on which to begin. A continent is at our feet. Other great centers and rolling prairies, richly luxuriant for abundant harvests, await the hands of labor. There is plenty of room. But they have "denied you a place to work." They have shut you out, and you have stupidly submitted to the eviction. Is it not time you stopped to think? The only place you can work, be you farmer or artisan, is on the land. You need not go to government for relief; all you need to demand is freedom to go to work. And voice this demand in a way that will force the time-serving politicians to listen to you. The method is simple; take for public revenue the annual value of land and abolish all taxation.

**N**EARLY all the explanation for the muddle-headed confusion of present day economic thought arises from the failure to distinguish between what is private and what is public property. This applies to all socialistic notions and to all the professorial explanations that are allied with it, and really arise out of the socialistic conception of society. Deny it as they may, every advocate of an income or inheritance tax is to that degree a socialist, for he is advocating the taking of private property

for public purposes, which at no time and under no circumstances, save in war, pestilence or famine, is a justifiable procedure.

**W**E are aware of course that the income tax is urged as a means to secure greater equality of wealth distribution. It is urged not merely as a revenue project but as a remedial measure. But if swollen fortunes arise from economic maladjustments it would seem to any sensible adult that the solution is the remedying of those economic maladjustments, not in the taking of a portion of this wealth after it is stolen, if it is stolen. And when it is realized that nearly all great fortunes have their origin in the diversion, direct or indirect, of public wealth into private pockets, we are nearing a solution more in accordance with sensible procedure. An analysis of almost every great fortune will disclose this. The exceptions to it are accidental and are too few to militate against the general truth.

**T**HERE are a few great fortunes that justify themselves. But in those cases such as Howe, McCormick, Edison, and perhaps Henry Ford, or the builders of great industries, they give to society more than they receive. Assuming that some part of even such fortunes comes from exploited labor, the remedy is not a stupid income tax, but the freeing of the exploited. In taking part of these great fortunes that originate in labor and the product of extraordinary genius or invention or management is monstrous. It is theft of a gigantic kind. It defeats itself in that it stifles productive effort and is a deterrent to progress. It is morally abhorrent, and some day will be so regarded, when we have finally determined what is public and what is private wealth, and recognize the implicit and profound injunction of the commandment, "Thou Shalt Not Steal."

**W**E are trying to weigh the President's words and make something out of them. He is great on phrases. Before two hundred guests at the National Conference on Economic Security he delivered himself of the following: "There can be no security for the individual amid general insecurity. . . . We cannot work miracles or solve all our problems at once." And as to what can be done, "it is to build a structure to give a measure of happiness to the individual greater than we have ever known." And looking at the 200 expert social workers, business men and labor leaders, the President said: "In this you can greatly help."

**I**N all of this there is a delightful vagueness. How they were to help, and what he was doing in which they might help, he failed to tell them. Miss Perkins said they left "in a state of exaltation." It is possible to become very much elated by a charming and persuasive

personality. Amy Semple McPherson has the trick and so have a number of our screen favorites. But what is it all about? How much was learned from the President at this meeting may be gathered from the report issued somewhat later by the National Association of Manufacturers which announced in effect that they did not know enough about unemployment and unemployment insurance, and urged the appointment of a presidential commission to study the subject. Just another commission and more official jobs to be paid for out of the public treasury by Roosevelt, the Lord Bountiful! This is all the exaltation which so delighted Miss Perkins seems to have resulted in.

**UNEMPLOYMENT!** Will they never hear or heed the great cry that goes up from the disinherited, "They have denied you a place to work! Land is a place to work!" "Unemployment insurance!" And this to be provided out of a fund extracted from the pockets of our burdened tax payers or wrung from the meagre wages of the employed!

**WRITERS** of the New Deal are bitter in their criticism of the Old Deal. The latter appears to have consisted of business men intent upon "chiseling" one another and exploiting the workers. From all accounts they were a sorry lot, not much above the racketeering gangsters that infest our great cities. The things that are being said about them are unbelievable. "The malefactors of great wealth," of whom we heard under another Roosevelt, appear in the descriptions vouchsafed us by the Tugwells and Richbergs to have been nearly all the business men, large and small, and it is these boys who have got us in the trouble we are in.

**IT** appears, as near as we can gather, that the Old Deal was actuated by "unrestrained competitive greed." Hence the depression. But competitive greed is not an economic factor. In a fair field where there are no monopolistic privilege, competitive greed is as harmless as any other personal trait. In the long run it defeats itself. Economics work through certain laws. Capital seeks its level, for one thing. If capital in the absence of monopoly yields profits in any industry above the normal return, additional capital enters in competition and the return is normal again. That is unrestrained competitive greed, or as sensible men would call it, free competition, restrained by natural economic laws. Mark, however, that we said, "in the absence of monopoly." Monopoly is an economic term as is free competition. "Unrestrained competitive greed" is just hooey.

**IT** is not in the power of the New Deal nor any other kind of a deal to restrain competitive greed if by that is meant the desire of business men to get a greater return. They can only do so in one of two ways, either by

putting greater efficiency into their business, or getting possession of a monopoly. And this monopoly must be a legally created one. It cannot be created by an individual, nor, save temporarily, by any combination of individuals. Tariffs, the control of natural resources or railroads and abuse of patents—these are legally created—there are no others. In other words combinations without monopolies are impossible.

**WHERE** did the Old Deal fail? Just where the New Deal fails. In neither instance is any effort being made to remove fundamental monopolies, the monopoly of the earth being the chief obstacle to any kind or degree of recovery. The Old Deal did a lot of useless patchworking. So does the New Deal. Only the latter differed in starting off with a lot of ballyhoo. Outside of proposed regimentation for everybody and everything not a single thing was done to remove the tendencies of which they complain, and which they make no effort to remove. There was nothing new about the New Deal really. Everything was to remain as it was—land monopoly, railroad, tariff monopoly. Just a few kind words and a genial smile were added.

**WHAT** about the Old Deal? Was nobody busy at that time trying to do something? Was it a period of total inactivity beginning before the World War and ending in 1932? Nobody believes that who reads the papers. A lot of things were proposed. If they failed to bring about improvement, that was because they did not touch the heart of the problem. There were a lot of labor legislation, a lot of social study, much social research. Men and women were inquiring, the Socialist party, especially in England, rose to power and put into effect a lot of nostrums for human betterment which failed again for the same reason that similar drugs and potions poured out from the New Deal medicine chest have failed. The Old Dealers asked what ought to be done—very earnestly they asked. It is not fair to say they did not ask. They did not listen to the answers because there was not a loud acclaim, only a few scattered voices telling them what to do, what they *must* do if civilization was to be saved. Now both the Old Deal and the New Deal have failed. It is curtains for both.

**THE** popular delusion which surrounds the subject of wages have the authority of eminent names—the inherent curse of all science and every department of knowledge. As most of our readers know, chief among these delusions now fast fading out, is the doctrine of the "wage fund," which teaches that in every community there is set aside a certain amount of capital for the purpose of employing labor and paying wages. The rate of wages depends upon the magnitude of the sum and the number of laborers who are to draw upon it. This theory

invented by Adam Smith has not gone unassailed. Thornton, Henry George tells us, made an assault upon it, as did Cliffe Leslie, but the assent to it was very general at one time and even now it bobs up every now and then.

**T**HINK of a "science" not being able to discover what is plain to the average intelligence that wealth in the material world is wrested by strong arms from the earth, and transformed by deft fingers to human uses; and that this production is limited by nothing but these strong arms and the round globe itself; and that it is all wages, save what is due capital for the loan of tools, and what is deducted in the name of rent. There is no fund set aside for the payment of wages, save the capacious treasury of the earth's storehouse.

**W**AGES are paid always out of the product, yet it is astonishing what great minds have been deluded by this idea of the payment of wages by capital, which has served as the basis for the assumption of an almost philanthropic origin of wages. Even Voltaire was deluded by it, keen and analytical as was the mind of the sage of Verney. What is the truth about wages? Not only are they not paid by capital, but that capital does not even advance payment, since wages everywhere are paid at the end of the week—*after*, not before the real wages are produced by the laborer. The laborer thus advances to the capitalist the capital necessary for the payment of his wage, and only then is he entitled to receive it. It is true that the employer may not at once turn this product into cash, but as a rule it is in a partially or fully created form before a penny of wages is advanced.

**I**T is obvious that Congress has abdicated. It is obvious, too, that a large part of the Republican party has followed its example. And what is even more hopeless is the reflection that the people of the country in large numbers seem content to let their convictions drift with the tide of public sentiment that spells unthinking acquiescence in the Roosevelt dogma. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, has aptly summarized it: "Americans have placed their faith in Mr. Roosevelt, not in his policies. It does not matter any longer what his policies are." Is not that true, and if it is true should it not give us grave concern? A country in which the people have no convictions, or in which convictions no longer count, is in a serious way.

**I**F Mr. Roosevelt himself were a man of convictions this strange apathy of a bewildered people would not greatly matter. Indeed it would not prevail, for there would ensue animated debates and a press alive to fundamental questions. But when people do not know what is going to happen in Mr. Roosevelt's mind from one

hour to the next, they just wait the next turn in a curious somnolence that is like death. Even the extraordinary changes that are occurring arouse but little interest; perhaps, as Dr. Butler tells us, these have ceased to matter. Only Roosevelt matters. This strange phenomenon has occurred before in history, but it is astonishing in a people once so strongly individualistic and so jealous of their prerogatives. It is a significant measure of our decline.

## Another Perplexed Philosopher

Reply by Walter Fairchild, Secretary of the American Association for Scientific Taxation, with acknowledgment to Robert Clancey of the *Researcher*, of the article by Harold S. Buttenheim entitled "If Henry George Were Writing Today."

**T**HE thoughtful article, which appeared in the *Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*, February, 1935, is highly interesting, because it presents the viewpoint of one who has approached the subject of land value taxation from the direction of city planning, zoning and housing, rather than by the route of a study of the writings of Henry George.

Mr. Buttenheim is editor of *The American City*. His experience is perhaps as broad as that of anyone in this country as to the subjects in which he is particularly interested. It is gratifying to find in his article complete endorsement of the major premise of Henry George, which is that all value of land is the product of community development and governmental services and should be taken by the community for the support of government.

A student of the writings of Henry George, however, may be pardoned, upon reading Mr. Buttenheim's article for feeling that, had Mr. Buttenheim read Henry George more carefully, he would have omitted many of his paragraphs.

It is true, as Mr. Buttenheim points out, that the land speculation resulting from the opening up of new territory which was a feature of the period prior to fifty years ago is not now as rampant as it was then. It is true that the world changes, but we doubt the statement, "Had Henry George been born a half-century later, he would have lived amidst a new set of economic conditions." Details may change, but the principle remains in its simplicity and has not changed. No one can read the introductory to "Progress and Poverty," written by Henry George in 1879, without being struck with the fact that the problem of today has been outlined as though it were written yesterday. Henry George refers to "streets lighted with gas,"<sup>1</sup> but this is the only old-fashioned or out-of-date reference to be found. But whether streets are lighted by electricity, gas, or oil lamps, the problem remains the same.

Mr. Buttenheim speaks of the slowing up of speculation in city real estate. Mr. Buttenheim does not mini-

<sup>1</sup> "Progress and Poverty," p. 7.

mize the disasters which have resulted from land speculation. We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Buttenheim in saying that such speculation "has permanently passed its peak." At no time in history has speculation in land values reached the heights that it did in New York and elsewhere within the past decade. The technocrats of recent fame are not the only ones to prophesy from the advance of the arts a future economic crisis more acute than any we have thus far known.

Mr. Buttenheim ascribes his assumption that land speculation has passed its peak to the "slowing up in population increase in the United States." Mr. Buttenheim draws a conclusion from this that land value or economic ground-rent will cease to increase. Mr. Buttenheim fails to observe as Henry George did that the increase in land value is only partly due to the increase of population and that there may be an increase in land value even though population remains fixed or even recedes. We cannot but feel that Mr. Buttenheim would profit by a study of Book II of "Progress and Poverty," where the subject of increasing and decreasing population is worked out by Henry George. In Book IV of "Progress and Poverty" and elsewhere, Henry George discusses the effect of material progress on the distribution of wealth. He says: "The changes which constitute or contribute to material progress are three: (1) increase in population; (2) improvements in the arts of production and exchange; and (3) improvements in knowledge, education, government, police, manners, and morals, so far as they increase the power of producing wealth." Henry George then proceeds to show the effect of increase in population apart from improvement in the arts and then the effect of improvement in the arts apart from increase of population. He makes it clear that "without any increase in population, the progress of invention constantly tends to give a larger proportion of the produce to the owners of land and a smaller proportion to labor and capital."<sup>2</sup>

The facts and fears that gave such furore to the technocrats a short time ago were anticipated by Henry George by half a century—but with a scientific base of explanation which the technocrats seem to lack.<sup>3</sup>

Among minor misapprehensions is Mr. Buttenheim's reference to farm land values and the effect of the "back to the land" movement. We think statistics disprove Mr. Buttenheim's assumption that "urban areas show more of their total valuation in improvements than do the rural areas" and that the Single Tax will cause an increase of taxation to the farm in comparison with city sites. We think the contrary is true. We estimate three-quarters of Manhattan Island to be only about twenty per cent improved from the viewpoint of area as well as

of land value, i. e., \$3,000,000,000 of the \$4,000,000,000 of land value in Manhattan is under-improved with business and residence slums. The balance is overdeveloped and overtaxed in spots. As we go outward to Queens, Bronx, Brooklyn and Richmond, improvement values rise in their ratio to land value. Going out still further into rural lands, the ratio rises still further in favor of improvements. Figures on rural site value in relation to improvements are largely lacking. Interesting studies have been made by Cornell, Wisconsin, and other research bodies, which tend to show that the labor side of a prosperous, going farm exceeds site value by a ratio of at least five to one. Even "fertility," usually classed as a natural resource, Prof. Commons points out is subject to depletion and after a generation of use fertility is largely a labor product.

Nor do we agree with Mr. Buttenheim's assumption that the "differential" in rent is less acute than formerly. The facts are quite to the contrary. Improved transportation, while making outlying districts more available, has made access to centers of population more easy, causing urban site values to reach higher peaks than ever before known.

Elimination of speculation in site values will undoubtedly—other things remaining equal—have the effect of lowering selling price of land and will tend to throw much valuable land now held idle, into use. "Back to the land" is not limited to farm land but applies to all valuable land, most of which in value is in the centers of population. This would not mean that the farmers, "already impoverished by surplus production, would be constantly menaced by an army of potential competitors." Not only would farmers go back to agriculture, but builders would return to construction of homes and factories, miners would return to mining coal and iron, and so on through the entire range of industries.

Nothing is clearer in Henry George's writings than the proposition that the restoration of equal access to natural resources, coupled with free exchange, will result in an equilibrium between the basic or extractive industries—agriculture, mining, oil production, which comes first—and the dependent arts—manufacture, invention, cultural arts, which follow and are built upon the primary industries. The same law of wages applies to all. With free exchange the raiser of wheat in Dakota is in a literal sense printing books in New York and painting portraits in Paris. The dreaded "menace" of "surplus product," when limited to labor products, is transitory and never permanent.

The elimination of the speculative holding of valuable land idle will throw such land into use, but we doubt that the true or economic value will be less than is estimated today. Perhaps in a few places, like part of New York City, an abnormal development has induced the assessor to place land value at a speculative level, but

<sup>1</sup> "Progress and Poverty," p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> "Progress and Poverty," p. 252.

<sup>3</sup> "Progress and Poverty," pp. 252-253.

this is not true of the country generally, where assessments are placed at about one-third of true value.

Furthermore, freer access to land and removal of barriers to exchange will bring about new uses of land which will tend to increase economic rent.

"Assessed valuation" for land may decline but—other things remaining equal—so also may legitimate costs of government decline. There may be less wars and wastes of war, less graft public and private, less tax collecting costs, less public borrowing (if any at all). Who can say that one will not balance the other? Economy in government and savings in waste increase land value or the share that goes to economic rent.

So also public "betterments" increase land value.

This brings us to the major point as to which Mr. Buttenheim seems to think Henry George would have changed his views; that is, that Henry George would now favor an income tax and an inheritance tax for social and economic reasons, even though all economic rent were taken by government. We do not think so,

Mr. Buttenheim has accepted whole-heartedly the fundamental principle that all public moneys spent for public works and public services is reflected in land value. Mr. Buttenheim will say, of course, that such expenditures must be *wisely* made in order to increase land value. In this we agree.

The basis of Mr. Buttenheim's argument for income and inheritance taxes seems to be that economic ground-rent will not furnish sufficient revenue to pay for all of the things which government "ought to incur" and that, therefore, recourse must be had to income and inheritance taxes.

Henry George was familiar with both of these forms of taxation. He recognized that both of these taxes, being levied after exchanges are complete, are direct taxes and cannot be shifted to buyers of goods. To that extent they do not share the condemnation applicable to indirect consumption taxes. There are, however, various ways in which these two forms of taxation violate the canons of taxation. They permit the holding of resources out of best use—the tax being levied on income only. The taxpayer, in the first instance, is the tax assessor—inducing evasion and avoidance. The income tax is secret—inducing fraud. It is a tax on industry—discouraging individual initiative. There can be little doubt today but that the income tax, which is now about a generation old in this country, is fast travelling the road of disrepute which was followed by the personal property tax to its ignoble ending.

But aside from these inherent defects of the income tax, there is one fundamental objection which Henry George clearly points out and which Mr. Buttenheim has overlooked in this article. This basic objection is this:

Money received by government from the income tax which is wisely spent for a public betterment or mainte-

nance service is reflected in an increase in land value. If government collects the annual value of that betterment or maintenance service from land value, then government has obtained it twice—once from the income tax payer and again from the land owner. If government takes it from the income tax payer and fails to collect the resulting value from the land owner, then the economic effect is that government has taken money from the pocket of the income tax payer and transferred it to the pocket of the land owner.

This is true also of the inheritance tax.

If we let the symbol I signify the income or inheritance tax payer, the symbol O represent the owner of land, and the symbol U represent US (that is, government), cause and effect would work out something like this:

I pays an income tax on his personal earnings;

U receives it and spends it for public betterment;

O gets the equivalent in the increase value of land.

If O keeps it, that which is left for I and U is merely a sort of IOU.

The inexorable result of this maldistribution is the piling up of an unearned excess or surplus product in O, with private debt as the status of I and public debt as the status of U, with O possessing ever-increasing power to dictate the terms of the obligation.

To say that the value of all governmental spending for public betterments and maintenance is reflected in land value is not the same thing as saying that all land value is a product of public spending. But the lesser is contained in the whole. Economic rent may be more than the total of all public budgets properly spent, but it cannot be less.

Henry George did not ascribe any "magic" to the Single Tax. On the contrary, he expressly teaches that it is not a panacea for all the economic ills of humanity. Among social problems to be solved in addition to the major one arising from the private appropriation of land values, Henry George mentioned patent laws; the difficulties of a national currency based on public debt and "farmed out" to private bankers rather than a currency based on exchanges; the creation and maintenance of a public debt; tariff walls erected for so-called "protection," even when not used for revenue purposes; embargoes, boycotts, and the like.

Recognizing all of these difficulties, Henry George nevertheless makes it clear that all human effort to correct our difficulties with respect to these other matters will be futile so long as the underlying evil, which Henry George calls the "great robber" of all, that is, private ownership of land values, remains.

All "superfluous and socially injurious savings," which Mr. Buttenheim mentions but does not define, can have their being only through monopoly of some kind. There are only two possible fields of monopoly: on the one side we have natural resources—land; on the other side we have labor products. Henry George first makes it

clear to his reader<sup>1</sup> that a monopoly of a labor product is an economic impossibility. The immediate effect of a "corner" or an attempted "pegging of price" of any commodity is an immediate increase in the production of that very same article. England tried it for rubber, Brazil tried it for coffee, Japan tried it for raw silk, pit traders have tried it for wheat. All failed, disastrously to themselves. The U. S. Government is now trying it for cotton and agricultural products. Its failure is already upon us.

Therefore, as Henry George points out, "if speculation be the cause of these industrial depressions, it must be in speculation in things not the production of labor, but yet necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth—of things of fixed quantity; that is to say, it must be speculation in land."<sup>2</sup> Henry George does not argue for the equal distribution of the production of all wealth. What Henry George stands for is the establishment of economic freedom; that is, equal access to natural resources and an equal sharing in the product of social growth and government. Differences will remain, but they will be differences in individual character, desires, and achievements, which are personal and which he would sacredly preserve to the individual.

## Pittsburgh Progressing in Economic Education

CONSTANT activity, both in the educational and legislative field, characterizes the situation in Pittsburgh in recent weeks. The Pittsburgh branch of the Henry George School of Social Science is going forward with its classes in a highly encouraging manner and, in addition to the large class conducted by Richard E. Howe, on Friday evenings at the University of Pittsburgh rooms, George E. Evans, President of the Henry George Foundation, has recently organized another strong class, which meets on Saturday in the City County Building. Both classes are making good progress and arrangements are now being made for a graduation banquet to be held about April 26, in which speakers of prominence will participate. Robert C. Bowers is acting as chairman of the committee promoting the interests of the School.

An Economic Discussion Club, recently organized under the leadership of Percy R. Williams, is holding regular meetings at dinner every Thursday evening at Chapin's restaurant with a growing interest and attendance. While this group was formed primarily for the discussion of economic problems, it is also serving as a clearing house for reporting and discussing various kinds of activity relating to economic advance, including legislation, educational classes, public meetings, etc.

### MAYOR McNAIR'S SPEAKING TOURS

Mayor William N. McNair continues to devote a great deal of his attention to public speaking and is in constant demand for public gatherings of all sorts in churches, clubs, schools, colleges, conventions, etc. In addition to numerous local appearances, Mr. McNair has recently addressed important gatherings in Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Reading and Greenville, Pa., and at the present time is planning an eastern tour to include Rochester,

New York City, Boston, Bridgeport, Conn., Wilmington, Del., and Washington, D. C. During the early part of May he expects to visit a number of important cities in the Middle West, presenting the Pittsburgh Tax Plan and also discussing fundamental social and economic problems confronting the country at the present hour.

### STATE LEGISLATION

Two important measures for the extension of the Pittsburgh Tax Plan have recently been introduced in the lower house of the Pennsylvania State Legislature. House bill 315, introduced by Representative John L. Powers on Jan. 28, embodies Mayor McNair's "Five-to-One" Tax Plan, which has been the subject of much discussion and publicity. This measure provides for the reduction of the building tax rate from fifty per cent of the land rate to twenty per cent, or one-fifth of the land rate, the shifting from improvements to land values to be accomplished over a period of four years beginning in Jan., 1936, and reaching its ultimate point in Jan., 1940. This would cut the present city building tax in half and would require one-fourth increase in the present land tax rate to raise the same amount of revenue now obtained.

House bill 753 introduced by Representative Alfred Tronzo, would apply the present graded tax system to the levying and collection of school taxes in the Pittsburgh school district and would give very substantial relief to the owners of improved real estate. These measures have been referred to committees in the lower house and may come up for action in the very near future as a number of representatives from Allegheny County have pledged their support.

Meanwhile, there has been a great deal of agitation concerning the "ripper" bill recently introduced in the State Legislature, which would abolish the office of Mayor and substitute a City Commissioner for Pittsburgh. While strong political pressure is being exerted in behalf of this bill, two Pittsburgh newspapers have recently conducted straw votes on the question, which have shown very strong majorities against the ripper legislation and such prominent organizations as the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, North Side Chamber of Commerce and Allegheny County League of Women Voters have passed resolutions strongly opposing this bill. Present indications are that the bill will probably be defeated in the State Senate.

## Lenin on Taxation of Land Values

THE proper application of the Georgian taxation of land values is a tax upon the mentality of a people beyond the capacity of a Nation not ten per cent of whom have learned to read. They can't understand it. They can only understand socialism at present. Some day, with a higher average of intelligence, we may adopt the taxation of land values and enjoy economic freedom, but not now.—Lenin, as quoted by Raymond Robins after an interview following the war.

*Globe Democrat*, St. Louis, Jan. 27, 1934.

## Hold the Destinies of the Community

The subject upon which I have been asked to address you is at the root of every social and economic question. We have innumerable organizations which are engaged in advocating specific social reforms—all most admirable. But they will all fail until the land question has first been settled. There is no economic or social question which is not at the bottom a land question. Land is essentially different from every other material property. It is from the land that all human needs are supplied, and if that original source is monopolized, if there are a few individuals who can control that supply, then they hold the destinies of the community in their hands.

LORD SNOWDEN in an address in London before the Women's National Liberal Federation.

<sup>1</sup> "Progress and Poverty," p. 267.

<sup>2</sup> "Progress and Poverty," pp. 267-268.

## Report of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

THIS month we would like to report a number of services that the Foundation office renders in its day-to-day correspondence, and we are picking certain letters from our files for illustration.

On Jan. 22, Congressman Charles Eckert of the 26th District of Pennsylvania, asked us to send him Mr. Hennessy's classic treatise on the economic causes of war and industrial depression, which was submitted to the League of Nations, May, 1927. We sent this booklet, together with other pamphlets on the subject of war and peace related to the "land question," and received Mr. Eckert's thanks for this material, which, it seems, was just the right thing for the Conference which was being held in Washington on the cause and cure of war.

Mr. Francis Neilson, author of "Sociocratic Escapades," recently asked us for a list of people who would be interested in his book. We sent him a list of about eighty names, and we understand that each one of these people received a free copy of this vastly interesting work.

Mr. James G. Blauvelt, who has been active in organizing the Ridgewood Henry George group, arranged for a donation of a complete set of George's writings and allied books for the Ridgewood Pease Memorial Library. The Henry George League of New Jersey is planning later to place books in other libraries.

The League is also endorsing a Single Tax measure which is being presented to the Legislature in New Jersey.

Mr. Henry Ware Allen of Wichita, Kan., presented to the Foundation his diary of birthday names of Single Taxers. Some of the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will remember that Mr. Allen placed the names of Single Taxers for each day in the year in his little booklet of Henry George quotations. If you would like to have your name added to the Roster, please send your name and birthday date, and it will be placed in the diary against the time of a new printing of the Henry George calendar.

We received from Mr. Eduardo F. Belaustegui, of San Isidro, Argentine, a most attractive book entitled "Social Economic Reforms," written in Spanish, dealing with the "Land Question" from the Georgist viewpoint. It is being added to our library.

We have at hand an excellent pamphlet entitled "Unemployment and Business Depression" from Mr. David Gibson of 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, O. Additional copies may be had for fifteen cents in stamps, if addressed to Mr. Gibson.

On Jan. 24, we received a request from one of the teachers in the University of Chicago for sample copies of our publications, so that he could call them to the attention of his students. To those who have claimed that it is useless to do any work with college groups,

this might be an interesting item. We sent a group of books which we knew would be most interesting and helpful, and received the following letter in acknowledgment:

"I want to thank you for your courtesy in sending me the publications of your Foundation. There has been considerable interest among the students in the work of your Foundation as well as in the writings and philosophy of Henry George. I have made these conveniently available to them, and have distributed the literature which you sent me. I am sure that many of the students will follow through the interest that has been indicated thus far."

On Feb. 13, Mr. Herman B. Walker wrote to us stating that there would be a debate on a network of twenty-four stations between Westfield, N. J. High School and the East Orange High School on the question, "Resolved: That real estate taxes should be relieved by sales taxes," and we were asked to send helpful material to the Westfield High School for the negative side. We wrote to the librarian, rounded up sales tax literature from various sources, presented to the Library Prof. Brown's book "The Economic Basis of Tax Reform," which wrestles with the stock objections to taxation on land values, and sent other pamphlets with the Georgist philosophy.

A very interesting request came from one of President Roosevelt's cabinet officers, asking us to send appropriate material on Henry George and the Single Tax to his son, who is at college in Ohio. We prepared special material, wrote a letter of explanation, and donated one or two books that would be particularly needed if the young man studied the subject for his thesis. We received extremely cordial responses from both the cabinet officer's secretary and the young gentleman himself.

### HENRY GEORGE CLASSES

As explained in previous issues of LAND AND FREEDOM, we are co-operating with John Lawrence Monroe and the Henry George School of Social Science in getting extension classes formed for the study of "Progress and Poverty." We mentioned the people with whom we had been in touch in the last issue. Since then the following have sent in for books and have arranged to teach classes in their respective communities: Mr. Oswald Marquardt of New York; Mr. Julian Hickok, Philadelphia, who is teaching a class of over twenty pupils; Mr. E. G. Freyer-muth of South Bend, Ind.; Mr. E. H. Boeck of St. Louis, class of twenty; Mr. Otto Dorn, who has started a class of twenty-five in Mount Vernon; Mr. L. B. Schwartz, who has enlarged his class since we last reported; Mr. L. M. Green of New York; Messrs. Tomfohr and Ellert of Milk River, Alberta, who are organizing a branch of the School in Alberta, and who sent in for large quantities of books and literature. Mr. Kaufman in St. Louis has had good success with adult groups and has sent in large lists of enrollment names. A number of books are being used by Mr. Luxton of Brooklyn, who has just started



a class. Mr. Rose of Pittsburgh has also been supplied for a class of eighteen.

We learn from Mrs. Bessie Beach Trueheart of Houston, Texas, that she is maintaining a local lending library of Henry George books. She finds that the "Story of My Dictatorship" is a popular booklet, and we are ordering for her and for others who are asking for it, a larger quantity of this very attractive new British edition which we expect will be on hand shortly. The price of the booklet, to include postage, will be thirty cents a copy, and four for \$1.00.

Mr. Tideman of Chicago is starting his second class in the "Science of Political Economy" and has ten pupils to date. Mr. Willis Malone of St. Louis has been active in distributing the new edition of the "Condition of Labor," which retails at fifty cents containing considerable additional material—especially the letter to members of his diocese, of Bishop Nulty, of Meath, Ireland. Due, no doubt, to the activity of our friends in Mississippi, we received an order from a Supreme Court Judge in Jackson, Miss., for fifty copies of the lecture "Moses" by Henry George.

From a professor of economics in the University of Illinois we received an additional order for sixteen copies of "Progress and Poverty." This gentleman orders on an average of 150 copies a year for his classes.

Prof. Darwin Smith, President of the California College of Commerce, is teaching "Progress and Poverty" to a class of twenty in his regular school work. He is contemplating another class of evening meetings, and we hope to have more to report on this at a later date. Prof. Smith has been a constant correspondent, and it will be a valuable addition to our movement in California, if Prof. Smith undertakes the work of teaching evening classes in "Progress and Poverty."

Prof. Smith writes:

"I am thinking seriously of organizing a class to study 'Progress and Poverty.' I have sent for a copy of the Teacher's Manual. The twenty copies you sent me were taken immediately by an adult discussion group connected with the Congregational Church here. I think a class for the study of this book will be worth while because so many people, who just read it, don't seem to get the idea Mr. George has to present."

Members of the East High School at Rochester, N. Y., have ordered many copies of Henry George's books. There seems to be a center of interest in that city.

Princeton University has sent its regular order for fifty copies of "Progress and Poverty."

From Prof. R. F. Wood, Department of History, Central Missouri State Teachers College, we received the following letter:

"I have enjoyed very much 'The Philosophy of Henry George' by Dr. George R. Geiger. I have been a reader of the principles of Henry George for the past twenty-five years and want to say that he has never been answered."

Through the courtesy of Mr. Fiske Warren, an adver-

tisement will appear in the magazine "Motion Pictures of the World and Its Peoples," advertising the Enclaves of Economic Rent, and incidentally, Mr. Warren has included an advertisement of "Progress and Poverty," and a special offer for a free copy of his book "Enclaves of Economic Rent," with every copy of "Progress and Poverty" that is purchased. He also calls attention to the Henry George School.

Summing up the volume of books and pamphlets that have gone out of the office since the last inventory date, May 9, 1934, to March 9, 1935, we find that 4,640 books have been distributed, 30,504 pamphlets, and an unestimated number of advertising leaflets. To those who think that "Progress and Poverty" is too long to read and that people do not want it, may we call attention to the fact that this book has always been the leader of the Henry George books, and of the 4,640 books sold and mentioned above, 2,206 represent copies of "Progress and Poverty." The next best seller is "Social Problems," of which 830 copies were distributed. Our records show a sale of 666 books to bookstore dealers during the ten months, of which 482 copies were "Progress and Poverty" unabridged, and 184 other titles, showing that the general public calls for "Progress and Poverty" oftener. We note, however, that since we launched the new edition of "Social Problems" in 1934, a demand has grown up for that book as well.

The correspondence in the office has been heavy, and we estimate that anywhere from ten to fifteen letters a day are received and answered.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

## Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

1. That most effective instrument of publicity, the Radio, will be employed even more extensively during 1935 than it was in 1934.

This year President Ingersoll will broadcast more than 800 Single Tax messages, many of them over chain systems consisting of from 20 to 50 stations each. These messages will be heard by many millions of listeners.

In addition to this regular Radio campaign, the very interesting and important series of Radio interviews featured under the title "His Honor the Mayor," will be continued until every city east of Chicago will have the opportunity to "air" its taxation problems. Nearly all of the Mayors eagerly seize the chance to get on the air to talk about their beloved cities.

We get our Radio time free of charge because of the feature value of our broadcasts; nevertheless our Radio campaign entails a heavy expense. It is the modest increase in our income in recent months that has enabled us largely to expand our Radio propaganda.

MR. INGERSOLL'S CURRENT BROADCASTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Monday: WCNW, 2:45 p. m.; WMCA, 10:30 p. m.  
 Wednesday: WWRL, 1:15 p. m.; WCNW, 2:45 p. m.;  
 WBBC, 3:30 p. m.; WMCA, 10:30 p. m.  
 Thursday: WLTH, 10:15 a. m.; WCNW, 2:45 p. m.;  
 Friday: WILM, 3:30 p. m.; WDCL, 3:30 p. m.; WDAS,  
 5:15 p. m.  
 Saturday: WDAS, 10:45 a. m.; WMCA, 10:30 p. m.  
 Sunday: WMCA, 11:00 p. m.

This schedule of broadcasts is subject to change from time to time but those listed above will be increased in number during the spring and summer.

2. During the year the Club will vigorously promote a campaign designed to persuade Single Taxers everywhere to connect themselves with, and to enter actively and aggressively into the work of the local organizations of the two major political parties. This is the most important field of activity than can possibly be occupied by Single Taxers today and it is a field that is wide open. The Club will act as a school for training and helping Single Taxers to meet the problems and situations they encounter in this direct-action political work.

This is the kind of work that has been so effective in western Pennsylvania, in California and in many other sections.

We have already persuaded a number of our members to engage actively in promulgating Single Tax principles in the local organizations of the two old parties here in New York City with most gratifying results.

There are so many wild, unsound economic measures now put forth by members of both of the old parties that the sane, sound, simple story of the Single Tax actually seems conservative and unanswerable to many of the political workers who can be brought to study and consider its obvious contrast to the liberty-destroying schemes of the artificialists.

3. The Club is undertaking the colossal task of compiling a list as complete as may be humanly possible of all the Single Taxers in the United States, this list, when completed, to be accessible to all Single Tax organizations, foundations, schools and publications.

Our mailing list has already had many accessions and we will keep up the work until we have a more complete list of Single Taxers than has ever before been compiled or attempted.

4. The publication of *democracy*, a Weekly Journal of Fundamental Economics, which will print selected examples of President Ingersoll's broadcasts and will contain other pungent and interesting articles as well as current economic comment. Volume 1, No. 1 of *democracy* has met with a very favorable reception. We hope to have this paper on a self-supporting basis within six months. The best Single Tax writers in America will contribute to *democracy*.

Since the above was written we have had most flattering commendation of *democracy* from many of the leaders of the Single Tax movement throughout the United States. If this enterprise receives the financial support

it deserves, *democracy* will be a great success and will operate as a powerful influence for promoting democratic thought.

5. During the year the Club proposes to sponsor at least a half dozen dinners, each of said dinners to be in honor of a Single Taxer who has attained national recognition by reason of some striking and distinctive achievement or service in advancing the cause.

At the first of these dinners, on April 6, Hon. William N. McNair, Mayor of Pittsburgh, will be the guest of honor and chief speaker.

The next dinner will be in honor of Hon. Jackson H. Ralston who is leading the campaign for the adoption of a Single Tax Amendment to the Constitution of California.

The Club will be glad to receive nominations of those considered entitled, by reason of their special achievements or services in promoting the Single Tax cause, to rate as honor guests at dinners to be staged during the coming summer and autumn.

6. The Club furnishes able lecturers to address Boards of Trade, Chambers of Commerce, meetings of Kiwanis, Rotary, Lions and other like clubs, civic organizations, political meetings, literary societies, schools, colleges and universities.

The Club has been compelled to turn down a few invitations to deliver addresses in distant parts of the country because of the traveling expense involved, but has been and will be able to respond to all calls within a distance of three hundred miles and, of course, will be glad to send lecturers to more distant points if assisted in the matter of traveling cost.

7. The distribution of the works of Henry George and of other Single Tax literature.

We do not wish to encroach upon the field of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, but we have some old, rare and odd tracts and pamphlets on hand and will be glad to furnish these to members or non-members upon application. Any inquiries regarding this old Single Tax literature will be promptly answered.

We have also a limited stock of the works of Henry George, Thomas G. Shearman, Louis F. Post, John S. Codman, C. B. Fillebrown and other elders of the movement including several editions of each of the various books.

8. Persuading and inspiring Single Taxers to write communications and timely articles for the newspapers and magazines.

We have been urged to revive and reorganize the old "Letter Writing Corps" and would be glad to receive the advice and suggestions of our members about this matter and about the whole plan of promoting Single Tax letter writing in a systematic way.

A few extracts from a broadcast illustrating one of the methods which Mr. Ingersoll employs the Radio to spread a knowledge of Single Tax principles:

From a Radio interview over WMCA on March 17 with Mr. Walter Fairchild by Mr. Charles H. Ingersoll. (Mr. Fairchild is a member of the New York Bar,

former President of the Manhattan Single Tax Club and President of the Association for Scientific Taxation.)

Q. "Mr. Fairchild, I understand you are anxious to get rid of this sales tax that has recently been placed on consumers in New York City, and I wish to ask you a few questions about it. For example, what do you suggest in place of the sales tax?"

A. "That's a fair question. I don't think anyone has a right to tell the City Administration to repeal the sales tax without at the same time showing where to get the money which the City must have."

Q. "What do you propose, then?"

A. "I propose a tax by the city on property which gets the *benefit* of the city taxes—that is, the land values of the city."

Q. "In what special form would you impose a tax of this character at this time?"

A. "I propose a special excise tax to be levied immediately on vacant land and on under-improved property; that is, on valuable land which is not used or which is not adequately used."

Q. "Now, Mr. Fairchild, wouldn't this special tax you advocate tend to increase the cost of living?"

A. "No, it would not because it is a tax on the privilege of using city services which are now wasted by the holders of vacant lands and under-improved sites."

Q. "Have you any data showing approximately what proportion of the sites of New York City is inadequately improved?"

A. "We estimate, both in area and land values, about three quarters of Manhattan are under improved. Nearly \$3,000,000,000 of land value in Manhattan is blighted with residence and business slums. This means that the city treasury loses each year more than \$50,000,000 in taxes on under-improved property in Manhattan alone."

Q. "What are the chief factors that operate to create site values in New York?"

A. "The services rendered by the City of New York through its tax budget, population, and the concentration of commercial activities."

Q. "Do you think that the sales tax is worse than many other taxes that we have?"

A. "It is the most burdensome and destructive of all forms of taxation."

Q. "How would your proposed tax affect unemployment relief?"

A. "It would raise more than \$50,000,000 a year and would lessen the need for unemployment relief."

Q. "How would it do that?"

A. "By stimulating building on lots that are now held idle, it would increase employment."

Q. "Why are you so strongly in favor of taxing land values rather than improvements?"

A. "Because land values, being a social creation, rightfully belong to the public and should be taken by the government, which is the agent and instrument of society, for public needs."—CHARLES S. PRIZER.

## On the March With John Lawrence Munroe

FIELD DIRECTOR, THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCE

SPEAKING APPOINTMENTS, JANUARY 28 TO MARCH 19, 1935, INCLUSIVE

(With the approximate attendance and the name of person by whom each appointment was secured.)

South Bend, Ind.—Economics Class, Mr. O. J. Keltner, Instructor, Central Senior H. S.; 30; Dr. E. G. Freyeremuth; 10 a. m.; Jan. 28. Assembly of Social Science classes; Central Senior H. S.; Mr. C. L. Kuhn, Instructor; 80; 11 a. m.; Jan. 28. Civic Planning Assn.; 30; Dr. Freyeremuth; noon; Jan. 28. Assembly, Riley H. S., Glenn S. Kropf, Principal; 600; Dr. Freyeremuth; 10 a. m.; Jan. 30. Lions Club; 25; Dr. Freyeremuth; noon; Jan. 30. Thomas Commercial School, Mrs. B. R. Thomas, Pres.; 30; 11 a. m.; Jan. 31. South Bend Com. College, Mr. M. D. Puterborough, Pres.; 200; 8:30 a. m.; Feb. 1. Exchange Club; 28; Dr. Freyeremuth; noon; Feb. 1. Men's Club, First Christian Church, Rev. Elmer Ward Cole; 184; 9:30 a. m.; Feb. 3. Forum, First Presbyterian Church, Rev. Charles T. Baillie; 35; 7:30 p. m.; Feb. 3.

Elkhart, Ind.—Elkhart Economic Forum, James A. Bell, Pres.; 30; 8:00 p. m.; Jan. 28.

Goshen, Ind.—Elkhart Co. Farmers Union, Lloyd Martin, Pres.; 100; 8:00 p. m.; Jan. 29.

Grand Rapids, Mich.—Public Meeting, Henry George Club, Mr. M. Herman Friedrich, Sec.; 30; 8:00 p. m.; Feb. 5. Assembly, Davenport McLachlan Institute, Mr. M. E. Davenport, Pres.; 200; 8:45 a. m.; Feb. 6. Assembly, Heaney Com. College, Herbert M. Heaney, Pres.; 80; 9:45 a. m.; Feb. 8. Discussion Club, M. H. Friedrich; 6; 8:00 p. m.; Feb. 8.

Lansing, Mich.—Economics Class, Ray Robson, Instructor, Peoples University; 7; 7:30 p. m.; Feb. 11. Current Events Class, Maxwell G. Sweitzer, Instructor, Peoples University; 18; 7:30 p. m.; Feb. 12. Lansing Business University, Mr. M. F. Denise, Mgr.; 100; 10:30 a. m.; Feb. 14.

Detroit, Mich.—Civic club; 82; Mr. Lutey, Sec.; noon; Feb. 20. Society for Economic Freedom, A. Laurence Smith, Pres.; 9; noon; Feb. 21. Fellowship, Y. M. C. A., Turner W. Ross, Chairman; 18; 8:00 p. m.; Feb. 23. Economics Class, Walsh Institute of Accountancy, Archie D. Waring, Registrar; 25; 10:30 a. m.; Feb. 25. Economics Class, Prof. E. W. McFarland, Wayne University; 25; 2:30 p. m.; Feb. 27. Detroit Federation of Womens Clubs; 30; Wm. L. Palmer; 2:45 p. m.; Feb. 28. Java Club, Y. M. C. A.; 25; Henry C. L. Forler; 9:00 a. m.; March 3.

Birmingham, Mich.—Rotary Club, J. B. Howarth, Sec.; 50; noon; Feb. 25.

Toledo, Ohio.—Scott High School, Mr. R. H. Demorest, Principal; 300; 11 a. m.; March 4. Toledo Economic Forum, Robest L. McCaig, Pres.; 30; 8:00 p. m.; Mar. 4. Economic Class, Prof. L. L. McKibben, Y. M. C. A.; 10; 8:30 p. m.; March 5. Bowling Green State College, Dr. H. B. Williams, Pres.; 8;00 11 a. m.; March 6. Economics Class, Prof. Clayton C. Kohl, Bowling Green State College; 60; noon; March 6. Non-Partisan Progressive League, Thomas Oakes, Pres.; 200; 8:00 p. m.; March 6. Church Supper, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Rev. Elwood Rowsey, Pastor; introduced by Rev. W. W. Young; 35; 6:00 p. m.; March 7. Kenilworth Club, Grace Reform Church, Robert Johnson, Pres.; 200; 8:00 p. m.; March 8. Lucas Co. Federal Transient Bureau, Rev. W. W. Young; 100; 8:00 p. m.; March 9. Channing Club, First Unitarian Church, Rev. Walton E. Cole, Pastor; 20; 7:00 p. m.; March 10. Knights of the Round Table, Hal Gilbert; 30; noon; March 11. Economics and Social Science Classes of Profs. Arvid T. Johnson, C. J. Bushnell, and C. K. Searles, University of Toledo; 50; 10:30 a. m.; March 12. Y. M.

C. A. group of young men, Martin L. Hanna, Chairman; 18; 7:45 p. m.; March 12. Automotive Workers Class, Prof. L. L. McKibben; 10; 7:00 p. m.; March 13. Briar and Java Club, Lester Hunt, Pres.; 30; 8:00 p. m.; March 13.

Pittsburgh, Pa.—Mass Meeting for Mayor William N. McNair; 200; 8:00 p. m.; March 19.

#### EXTENSION CLASSES ORGANIZED

South Bend, Ind.—Dr. E. G. Freyermuth, Instructor. First Class. First meeting held Feb. 4; attendance 13. Meets Monday evenings in Dr. Freyermuth's office, 303 S. Michigan St.; enrollment from among Dr. Freyermuth's friends and from people interested at lectures.

Grand Rapids, Mich.—Mr. Harry C. White, Instructor; Mr. M. Herman Friedrich, Organizer. First Class. First meeting held Feb. 7; attendance 8. Enrollment at second meeting, 13. Meets Wednesday evenings at Davenport McLachlan Institute through the courtesy of Mr. M. E. Davenport, Pres. Enrollment principally from young men who heard lectures or who read reports in newspapers.

Cedar Springs, Mich.—Mr. J. S. Tindall, Class Leader. First Class. First meeting Feb. 16; attendance 8. Enrollment approximately 15. Meets Wednesday evenings at Cedar Springs High School. Enrollment mainly from farmers in the vicinity and from Mr. Tindall's fellow townsmen.

Detroit, Mich.—Mr. Frank L. Morris, Instructor. First Class. Organization meeting held Feb. 26. Meets Tuesday evenings in Mr. Morris' home, 1806 Canton Ave. Enrollment from instructor's friends.

Toledo, Ohio.—Prof. L. L. McKibben, Instructor. First Class. Organization meeting held March 14; attendance 15. Meets Thursday evenings in the Y. M. C. A. as a part of an adult educational movement. Enrollment from among those who have studied the subject under Prof. McKibben and Mr. Robert L. McCaig in a special class last year, and from among those who heard the lectures.

#### SUMMARY

Talks, 43. Attendance, upwards of 4,170.  
Classes organized, 5. Enrollment, upwards of 60.  
Copies of "Progress and Poverty" sold, 46.  
Manuals sold and placed, 15.  
Signed requests for literature, 350.  
Publicity in all the leading newspapers.  
Interviews with dozens of persons.

#### NOTES

In addition to the one class already started in Grand Rapids, Mr. Friedrich, secretary of the Henry George Club of Grand Rapids, has immediate plans for organizing one in his church. His goal is 100 graduates of the extension classes in this city during 1935.

\* \* \*

Mrs. Raymond Starr, daughter of the late revered Gerrit Johnson of Grand Rapids, is greatly interested in the extension class work.

\* \* \*

The People's University of Lansing, Mich., is a significant adult education movement. Some 90 classes are held under voluntary instructors in free places of meeting. Mr. Ray Robson, organizer of the Henry George Club of Lansing, has been conducting economic classes since the University was started.

\* \* \*

Mr. A. Laurence Smith, president of the Society for

Economic Freedom (Detroit's Henry George organization), is negotiating with the Board of Education to secure meeting places for extension classes of the Henry George School of Social Science. He is thoroughly convinced of the value of the School method and hopes to see many classes started in Detroit.

\* \* \*

Mr. J. L. Palmer, secretary of the Society for Economic Freedom, is Detroit's newest active recruit to the Henry George movement. His plans are ambitious and he has the capacity for making them succeed. Years of experience in the "land racket" as an executive of land speculation companies made "Progress and Poverty" appear to be more than a fanciful theory when he first read it attentively two or three years ago.

\* \* \*

Mr. Robert L. McCaig seems destined soon to lose the distinction of being "the only active Single Tax advocate in Toledo." At any rate he has been doing his best to lose it. He arranged fifteen appointments for Mr. Monroe from March 4 to 13, which reached a combined audience of not less than 1,863 persons. The Toledo papers gave several well written reports. One extension class is already started under Prof. L. L. McKibben, formerly of the University of Toledo, who conducted a ten month's course in "Progress and Poverty" at Mr. McCaig's home two years ago. Mr. McCaig is planning to start a class which he will himself conduct in his home. Rev. W. W. Young, youthful and vigorous apostle of Social Justice, plans to start a small class at his home, drawing the enrollment from among his fellow social workers.

Following Mr. Chodorov's suggestion I am herewith giving the date on the Chicago and St. Louis extension classes. (I had nothing to do with organizing these).

Chicago, Ill.—Henry L. T. Tideman, Instructor. Second Class. First meeting, March 18. Meets each Monday night in office of John S. Swift Co. Enrollment of 8 from among students in Mr. Tideman's first class. This is an advanced course using the "Science of Political Economy" as textbook. Mr. Maurice Welty, Instructor. First Class. First meeting March 12. Meets each Tuesday evening 6 to 8. Enrollment of 12 mainly secured through members of Mr. Tideman's first class. Mr. Henry H. Hardinge, Instructor. First Class. First meeting, Jan. 18. Meets every second Friday in homes of students. Twenty-two enrolled from the Peoples Church of which Preston Bradley is pastor. Mr. Henry L. T. Tideman, Instructor. Third Class. First meeting in February. Meets Thursday night in Sherwin-on-the-Lake Hotel, 1205 Sherwin Ave. Enrollment of sixteen; irregular attendance; eight "Progress and Poverty" sold. Organized by a student in Mr. Tideman's first class. Mr. Henry L. T. Tideman, Instructor. Fourth Class. First meeting, March 22, at Chicago Labor College. Meeting each Friday night. Enrollment secured by the College.

Oak Park, Ill.—Mr. J. Edward Jones, Instructor. Second Class. First meeting, Jan. 31. Meets each Thursday evening. Enrollment of eight mainly secured through first class.

St. Louis, Mo.—Mr. Noah Alper, Instructor. Started in November and consolidated with students from a Sunday School Men's Class. Held in Temple Israel Friday evenings. Began use of Henry George School Manual about Jan. 15. Mr. Erwin Kauffmann,

Instructor. First Class. Began latter part of January. Meets Monday nights in Hamilton Christian Church, Hamilton and Julian Avenue. Enrollment of six mostly from Men's Class of the Church. Three-hour session, 7:30-10:30; continues over more than 10 weeks. The class is under the auspices of the Mo. Relief and Reconstruction Commission, working through the Board of Education of St. Louis. Mr. Erwin Kauffmann, Instructor. Second Class. Started in November discussing Current Events. "Social Problems" to be used as textbook. An average attendance of ten from among Electrical Workers Union. Meets in Electric Hall, Boyle and Gibson, Monday and Wednesday, 9 to 12 a. m. The students have petitioned the Board of Education to furnish them with textbooks.

## Washington Women Active

THE monthly meeting of the D. C. Woman's Single Tax Club was held on Monday, March 4, at the hospitable home of Prof. and Mrs. Louis Cohen, 4701 Connecticut Avenue northwest.

Mrs. Marie H. Heath, vice-president, was chosen to fill the position left vacant by the resignation of Mrs. Walter N. Campbell as president.

During the business meeting, it was unanimously voted to continue membership in the National Federation of Women's Clubs, and to try to get a Single Tax speaker before one or more of their meetings.

The appreciation of the club was expressed for the contribution of Mr. Joseph B. Chamberlain of Kensington, Md., toward the meeting, in the form of artistically printed postcard announcements.

An invitation was extended by Mrs. Jessie Lane Keeley, who was unable to be present, to hold the annual Single Tax picnic at her home in Riverdale, Md., on the last Sunday in May, as usual.

It was announced that Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, inventor of the "Landlord's Game and Prosperity," would shortly begin a correspondence course of study with the Henry George School of Social Science.

Mr. Chamberlain read a paper containing suggestions for furthering the cause of economic freedom, and strongly urged the establishment of a Single Tax headquarters at the National Capital.

Attention was called to President Roosevelt's tribute to Henry George as one of the really great thinkers of the country, whose writings should be better known; and also to Norman Thomas's assertion that Henry George stands high in any list of Americans who have greatly served the world, and that his position that the rental value of land belongs to society, has never been successfully disputed.

Mrs. Gertrude E. Mackenzie read a satire on crop destruction, written by a Wilmington, Del., man who, having heard of the money being paid to restrain farmers from raising hogs, had decided to go into the business of not raising hogs himself, and asked for information as to the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on, the best strain of hogs not to raise, how best to keep an inventory of the hogs he would not raise, and whether capital could be provided by the issuance of a non-hograising gold bond.

By this time the speaker of the evening, Representative Theodore L. Moritz, of Pennsylvania, had arrived, and the members listened with interest to an informal talk on the reasonableness and practicability of the land-value tax, followed by the reading and discussion of a bill which he planned to introduce into Congress in the near future.

The discussion continued during the serving of refreshments and ended only when the club adjourned at a late hour, to meet on Monday, April 1, at the home of Mrs. Daisy R. Campbell, 4915 Fourth Street northwest.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

ECONOMIC truth is considered unsafe to teach by college economists. That is why there are more braintrusters in office than owners of trustworthy brains.

## The Henry George School of Social Science

THE enrollment for the Spring term at the Henry George School of Social Science has been most encouraging. Notwithstanding that ill health in the midst of our campaign for new studnets hampered greatly, we were able, through the capable help of Mr. Frank Chodorov, to increase the roster fully twenty-five per cent over the previous term beginning in Sept., 1934. At any rate, we enrolled 227 students for the current semester, divided into ten classes.

Practically none of these even knew who Henry George was previous to enrollment. It has been a tremendous stimulus to the staff of teachers to note the increasing enthusiasm with which at each session these former strangers to George's philosophy have greeted its elucidation. The attendance has been about normal and the number who wait after classes for discussion of separate phases has been heartening to the instructors.

To carry out a policy that seemed obvious during last summer, the director has steadily tried to increase the staff of instructors so that the work of the School would be continuous no matter what befell any particular one of its staff members. The result is that to the names of Messrs. Stephen Bell, Otto K. Dorn, and Will Lessner who conducted classes last term, it is gratifying to add those of Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, Spencer Heath, Charles Joseph Smith and Walter Fairchild—all of whom conduct classes once a week and are discharging their duties with a satisfaction born of the knowledge that brand new personalities are seeing the light that only George has shed on the perplexing problems of the day.

Incidentally, the teaching staff meets every other Monday to discuss and perfect classroom technique. Readers will readily realize the value of this when it is known that it is easier to get some students onto our registration record than to hold their interest—no doubt, due to the competition of other interests.

On Jan. 28, those who had taken the course during the fall term sat down to dinner at the Old Kentucky Restaurant on East 48th Street, 122 strong. This dinner was an inspiring affair. Anna George de Mille presided and Frederick Cyrus Leubuscher gave one of his straight-to-the-point talks with Walter Fairchild and Miss Amy Mali Hicks contributing their part to the general enthusiasm. Miss Helen D. Denbigh discussed the subject of the extension courses and impressed all present with the vast importance of this work. The work of Mr. John Lawrence Monroe is reported in another column.

Perhaps those who have been believers for years got the most satisfaction when they listened to short three-minute talks from students who had just completed the first part of the course. There were twelve of these

selected out of some thirty who were eligible to speak. Time would not allow all of them to address the diners. The following were the student-speakers introduced most happily by Mr. Dorn: Mr. Edmund P. Donovan, Mrs. Madeline Swarte, Mr. Andrew P. Christianson, Miss Sally Kurz, Mr. Benjamin F. Halpern, Mr. Herbert M. Garn, Miss Marie D. Sarkar, Mr. James F. Oastler, Mr. William H. Falconer, Mr. Jesse A. Zeeman and Mr. Donald Marcellus.

A real thrill came as it was realized that these speakers passed over any discussion of the Georgan philosophy as being entirely convinced of its justice but plunged into a demand, coupled with plans, that we set about "getting" it into practice. Surely, those who had spent the necessary hours in elucidating George's proposals to them felt amply compensated.

It brought Mr. Leubuscher to his feet for the second time to remind old timers who were present that in view of this constructive work, when wills were made the Henry George School of Social Science should not be forgotten. He had it in his will.

The Keystone of this oratorical arch was put in its place by Edward Ross who recited most eloquently the entire "Ode to Liberty" in "Progress and Poverty" from memory. As Mr. Ross is an actor by profession, his rendition was an unusual treat—one that will lodge long in the memory of those who heard it.

Space presses, so this must be brief. About 47 new members will be nominated for election to the Student-Alumni Council—that body which is most closely connected with the School for its support. Those who have watched these newcomers develop believe that they are of the character that will push the School forward with vigor.

In conclusion, the extension courses are mounting rapidly in numbers. Since the last report, nearly 200 are already enrolled and more forming. These classes were formed by time-tried members of our movement:

Instructor	City	Meeting Place	No. of Students
Mr. Julian P. Hickok,	Phila., Pa.	Public Bld.	15
Mr. Joseph R. Carroll,	Norfolk, Va.	Office	3
Mr. E. H. Boeck,	St. Louis, Mo.	Office	8
Mr. Frank L. Morris,	Detroit, Mich.	Home	13
Mr. J. S. Tindall,	Cedar Springs, Mich.	High School	21
Mr. John Luxton,	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Commercial School	19
Mr. Richard E. Howe,	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Univ. Classroom	55
Mr. Lincoln Crowell,	Sandwich, Mass.	Home	10
Mr. J. Edward Jones,	Oak Park, Ill.	Home	8
Mr. E. G. Freyermuth,	South Bend, Ind.		7
Mr. George E. Evans,	Pittsburgh, Pa.		25
Mr. Max Berkowitz,	Bronx, N. Y.	High School	9
Total			193

They meet as will be noted in offices, classrooms, home, etc., in the various cities as arrangements are possible. Their correspondence with the director is filled with most constructive suggestions and out of it all it seems plans

involving tremendous possibilities can be developed. In addition there are five or more classes already formed in England through the good office of Mr. A. W. Madsen of London, who is well and favorably known on this side of the Atlantic.

Inquiries are on file involving double the number reported, but names have not yet been filed.

The "Teachers' Manual" is used in the extension courses and while in need of revision, it serves as a splendid aid to those who are already using it. Taken all-in-all the activities centering in and around the School indicate that the enlisting of new faces and young people in our glorious cause can go just as far as we have the financial means. Cooperation of the most vital kind is evidenced both in person and in our mail. Considering our slender resources it seems as if the late Oscar H. Geiger showed us the way for the School is making progress that is most gratifying to those who have a part in continuing the work of the late inspired teacher.

NORMAN C. B. FOWLES, Director.

#### CALLS FOR A SANE POLITICAL ECONOMY

Christianity may soon be driven from the outside through their walls into our churches; a sane political economy may be taken up by our colleges; writers, trusted now by the public, may find it profitable to write some briefs for the truth, so that by the end of this century we shall have seen the end of land booms, the economic instrumentality for increasing the cost of living on the earth, paid by the great majority of mankind to the few beneficiaries of our rotten laws.

JAMES P. KOHLER, in *Miami Daily News*.

#### OUR CHAOTIC TAX LAWS

In closing it should be conclusively demonstrable to all thinkers, that if the people of a State by a majority vote decide to change the present chaotic tax methods, that insure poverty, unemployment and slums-breeding disease and crime, by relieving industry and human products from taxes, and resorting to the people's treasury, the ground rent accruing from the expenditure of their own money, that a new economic day of Justice and Peace had arrived. A day in which, from an abundant treasury, the disabled and diseased, would be given the best treatment that modern medical science has discovered: a day in which comfort and leisure could be enjoyed by all.

S. S. TABER, in *San Diego Labor Leader*.

#### HAS FAITH IN MAN

I am no detractor of the human race. I have faith in man. I know that he has worked his way up from ignorance, and every substantial advance has been on the crutches of pain. I am proud to belong to this indomitable human race. Man has persisted on and on, and up and up, through all the wearing, echoing centuries. I look at him through pity's tears, knowing we are only three days old, and as Victor Hugo says, "only the tadpoles of the archangels we are yet to be." I know the rough road man has travelled in working out the beast, the war-hog, the Gadarene spirit. I know that he has been burned by fever, torn by passion, checked by fear. Oh, man! My heart goes out to you.

DR. E. W. CULLEY in address at Melbourne, Australia.

TAXATION according to ability to pay destroys ability to earn.

## The Gold Clause Muddle

### CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION

By RAYMOND V. McNALLY

THE gold clause cases undoubtedly constituted the climax in the stirring drama that has gripped this country since the Roosevelt administration assumed office. The Constitution of the United States, as the central character, had been subjected to such brutal buffeting in a series of engagements involving AAA and the NRA up to Feb. 18, 1935, when the gold decisions were handed down, that the spectator had been left limp and gasping, hardly daring to take a square look to see whether his hero was up or down. The gold clause controversy entered on the scene at the psychological moment and the Supreme Court's decisions were hopefully expected to throw some light on the question as to whether the Constitution was still alive and whether it had ever been anything more than just a pleasant illusion.

A careful examination of both the majority and minority opinions leaves one with an almost hopeless feeling that the human mind, in the last analysis, when it can produce so much that is contradictory and incoherent, is a pretty dismal failure. One wonders whether Kant was right when he declared, in no uncertain terms in his "Critique of Pure Reason" that the Human Reason deceived itself and that we must depend on another kind of reason, that is, Pure Reason, if we wish to see things as they really are. Of course, the Constitution itself must be held partly responsible. Its connotations are so broad that, while they may have been perfectly clear to those honorable gentlemen who offered them as the fundamental laws of the land, when life was simple and unalloyed, they are quite meaningless to the complex society of today that has achieved a high level of material progress but little or no advance in the social sciences. One thing, however, is clear and that is that the Constitution as originally conceived for a nation of free men, is gradually being whittled away by those whose social philosophy is born and bred in a dearth of the precise definitions of words.

The case involving government obligations was in connection with a suit brought by the plaintiff as owner of a Fourth Liberty Loan  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent gold bond of 1933-1938 for \$10,000 which provided: "The principal and interest hereof are payable in United States gold coin of the present standard of value." When the bond was issued and when the plaintiff acquired it, a dollar in gold consisted of 25.8 grains of gold, .9 fine. The bond was called for redemption on April 15, 1934 and was presented for payment on May 24, 1934 by the plaintiff. When he was refused payment in coins of 25.8 grains or an equivalent in gold or in gold coins of 15 5-21 grains each, the content of the dollar at the time of redemption, he demanded

an equivalent value in legal tender currency, namely, \$16,931.25. The refusal of his request by the government was based on the Joint Resolution of Congress of June 5, 1933 (48 Stat. 113). The plaintiff brought suit because he claimed that he had been deprived of his property without due process of law.

The purpose of the gold clause, as the Court conceived it, was to provide a standard of value in order to afford protection against loss through depreciation in the medium of payment. The question was whether the Joint Resolution was a valid enactment so far as it applied to the obligation of the United States.

This resolution declared that provisions requiring "payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency" were "against public policy," and provided that "every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein," shall be discharged "upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts."

The Court declared that the Joint Resolution was unconstitutional, because while Congress had been granted power, through the sovereign will of the people, to issue obligations for the payment of money borrowed on the credit of the United States, it had not been given the power to alter or destroy those obligations. However, the plaintiff's claim for damages was denied because no loss had been proved. The Court was perfectly within its rights in drawing a distinction between the "binding quality of the obligation" and the "question of damages." It pointed out that before the change in the weight of the gold dollar on Jan. 31, 1934, gold coin had been withdrawn from circulation and Congress had prohibited the exportation of gold coin and placed restrictions on transactions in foreign exchange. It went on to say that the power to coin money included the power to prevent its outflow from the country and to impose restrictions on transactions in foreign exchange, and that, therefore, the plaintiff was not entitled to obtain gold coin for recourse to foreign markets or to engage in foreign exchange dealings. But it was at this point that the Court seemed to experience some difficulty in reconciling the borrowing power of Congress with its power to control currency, for it finally ruled that as the plaintiff would have to determine his damage only in relation to the internal purchasing power of the dollars he had received, he had actually sustained no loss. Although the Court had declared the Joint Resolution unconstitutional and had carefully explained that Congress did not have the power to destroy the obligations it had incurred, it permitted the power over money to destroy the borrowing power by narrowing the field for determining the amount of damages. In other words, it permitted the Constitution to be violated in spite of its rebuke to the government:

That the Constitution had been violated appears to

have been the view held by the minority justices, who, in no uncertain terms, stated that "valid contracts to repay money borrowed cannot be destroyed by exercising power under the coinage provision." These powers of Congress are equal. Neither should be allowed to dominate the other. If the gold clause was to be interpreted as setting up a standard of value and not as prescribing a mode of payment, how could the Court justify its opinion that because the plaintiff had been prohibited from receiving the gold coin promised him, the government could avoid its obligation by restricting the method of determining his damages? Was its decision one of expediency because it feared the consequences, if a reverse ruling had been rendered?

On the other hand, how could the minority justices justify their judgment that the plaintiff was entitled to an additional \$6,931.25, representing the amount of dollar devaluation, if the gold clause had not been interpreted by them as providing a mode of payment but as providing a standard of value against a loss and in view of the fact that no actual loss had been proved? Obviously, this would have been an injustice to the government, but the minority justices considered this \$6,931.25 to be the amount of the loss that the plaintiff had suffered. In my opinion, such judgment springs from primitive notions of value. Gold seems to be considered as something having a natural value irrespective of the ratio that its supply bears to demand. While it does not have an intrinsic value greater than that of any paper currency, the larger part of this value is due to the demand for it for monetary purposes. The market value of gold varies when new mines are discovered, but it varies more often because of the changes in the demand for it. Monetary history clearly shows that its value has constantly changed and that this has given rise to frequent recoinages and changes of system. We cannot look upon gold, therefore, as a fixed standard of value. Reducing the gold content of money does not necessarily reduce the value of that money. A reduction in the value of money through reducing its gold content could only be brought about by increasing the supply. That this was not done in this country when the dollar was reduced in gold content, is evidenced by the fact that the internal purchasing power of the dollar is greater now than it was at the time the bond was issued and when the dollar had a greater gold content. However, in the matter of determining the creditor's loss, the value of the dollar should also be considered in its relation to foreign currencies. In other words, the external value of the dollar at the time the bond was issued should be compared with its external value at the time the bond was redeemed, through the rate of exchange. In connection with this, it should be kept in mind that all currencies have undergone considerable change since 1918. Since that time, currencies have been depreciated

and most countries have been jumping on and off the gold standard. Nor has the internal purchasing power of the various countries remained stable. Furthermore, the internal purchasing power of the various currencies do not always correspond with the external value of those currencies. It was said that when England returned to the gold standard in 1925, the external value of the pound was fixed somewhat above its internal purchasing power and when France stabilized her currency in 1928, she fixed the external value of the franc well below its internal purchasing power. Abandoning the gold standard leads to a distrust in a paper standard and this has caused also an undervaluation of the various paper currencies. In order then to determine the true value of the different paper currencies expressed in terms of the dollar, we would have to estimate their purchasing power parities. And as for the gold currencies, it can hardly be said that the dollar has been placed at a disadvantage with them since 1918 in more than a few cases. But whether we are considering paper or gold currencies, we must keep in mind that the internal purchasing power of these currencies does not necessarily correspond with their value in terms of gold, as quoted on the exchanges.

The point I wish to emphasize is this: That while I do not believe the government is within its constitutional rights in restricting the creditor in his determination of his own damages, we must not lose sight of the fact that a dollar containing 25.8 grains is not necessarily more valuable than a dollar containing 15 5-21 grains. The burden of proof to show the actual loss he sustained is on the plaintiff, and I believe that any fears that might have been disturbing the majority justices as to the consequences were groundless.

In the light of the foregoing facts, it would seem that the gold clause, as a measure of value, is limited by its very nature as a protective device against loss. Assuming that the content of the dollar had not been reduced but that the internal purchasing power of the dollar had fallen, would the bondholder have escaped loss merely because he had received gold coin or its equivalent? To think so is to ascribe some mystic quality to gold. An example of the efficacy of the gold clause that is clear-cut, is a case in which the government issued a large amount of fiat money such as the "greenbacks" during the Civil War period. The bondholder, in such an event, should have no difficulty in proving a loss.

In turning to the case of the gold certificates, we find that the principle involved is practically the same. The plaintiff, holder of the certificates in the amount of \$106,306, claimed that when he presented them for redemption on January 17, 1934, an ounce of gold was \$33.43 and that because he had been refused gold coin, he had been damaged to the extent of \$64,334.07. He arrived at that figure by stating that he was entitled to 5,104.22 ounces of gold, that is, one ounce of gold for



each \$20.67 of the gold certificates. The Court denied his claim on the ground that these certificates did not call for gold as a commodity; that they called for gold coin, not bullion and that legally he could not have retained the gold coin, even though he had received it, for recourse to world markets. Therefore, he had actually sustained no loss in receiving legal tender currency. The plaintiff had conceded the power of Congress to regulate the currency so the question was simply one of just compensation. Although the Court held that as the certificates were currency and legal tender, they could not be regarded as warehouse receipts, it is significant that the government regarded them as such when they treated them as being superior to all other currency in circulation. Furthermore, a definite amount of gold coin had been deposited in the Treasury and held there for payment on demand of these certificates and was to be "used for no other purpose." Act of March 14, 1900 (31 Stat. 45). However, this act had fixed the content of the dollar at 25.8 grains and when the plaintiff presented his certificates for payment on January 17, 1934, the currency that he received was at a parity with that standard of value, as the content of the dollar was not reduced until January 31. Therefore, as the certificates did not call for gold as a commodity, the currency he received must be considered as an equivalent value and he could not logically ask for more.

The blunt opinion of the minority justices that these certificates were contracts to return gold left on deposit and that the plaintiff was entitled to the value of this gold in currency indicates that they considered them as representing gold as a commodity. This position I believe to be untenable. Furthermore, as the gold dollar had not yet been devalued, he certainly could not claim recourse to the foreign exchanges in order to determine his loss.

In taking up the case of the private bonds, we find that the question was the validity of the Joint Resolution which had abrogated the gold clause in private contracts. This case of course, while involving only private obligations, relates also to State and municipal obligations. The plaintiffs claimed that they had suffered losses because the Joint Resolution had compelled the obligors to pay in depreciated dollars. The Court ruled that the gold clause interfered with the authority of Congress to choose and maintain a uniform currency and that therefore the Joint Resolution was valid. It is difficult to see just how the uniformity of the currency is interfered with, if we are to interpret the gold clause as a measure of value and not as a mode of payment. In connection with this, the minority justices stated that the real purpose of the Joint Resolution was not to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies but "to destroy certain valuable contract rights." They seemed to be on firmer ground than the majority when

they said that while the authority exercised by the President and by Congress to regulate the currency was not challenged, there was no authority given under the Constitution to destroy validly acquired property rights. On this point, the majority cited the legal tender cases to support their contention that the "Fifth Amendment forbidding the taking of private property without just compensation or the deprivation of it without due process of law" referred only to a direct appropriation. The minority replied that the Joint Resolution caused a direct loss, but they weakened their opinion when they said that there was no "question here of the indirect effect of lawful exercise of power." But what is the "lawful exercise of power." Surely the Resolution is no less lawful than our tariff and unjust tax laws. It certainly is no more of a direct appropriation than the tariff, but I never heard of the consumer or importer being compensated because the power of Congress to regulate commerce destroyed validly acquired property rights. Nor was the consumer or importer compensated when the President suddenly devalued the dollar. But the minority justices seemed to be in awe of gold. Apparently, when gold is appropriated, that constitutes the taking of property, but when the consumer is deprived of part of his wages through the tariff for the benefit of a few people, that does not constitute the taking of property. This is making a fetish of gold, and it is about time the Supreme Court made an honest effort to define property, so it could find out what property really is. In spite of the difference of opinion over the meaning of the phrase, "due process of law," the majority and the minority, in drawing a distinction between a direct appropriation and an indirect appropriation, seemed to be agreed that an indirect appropriation was not unconstitutional. This vague, undefined and apparently innocent phrase, "due process of law," has much to atone for. It has been invoked innumerable times to plug up the gaps in the invoker's knowledge of the science of economics.

While it would not appear that the minority justices were more logical in ruling that the Joint Resolution was invalid, the plaintiffs certainly were not entitled to any compensation, as they had not shown any actual loss.

#### ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF GOLD CLAUSE DECISION

The immediate reaction of the stock market was no indication of the real economic effects of the gold clause decisions. The sudden rise of stocks and bonds was more forced than spontaneous. It was based partly on erroneous ideas of what the effects would be on the industrial world and partly on the hysterical efforts of speculators to spread rumors that inflation would be the next step in the political drama. That the Court's decision with respect to government bonds was an encouragement to inflationists, cannot be denied. The rebuke to the govern-

ment for attempting to repudiate its obligations, sharp in tone though it was, fell flat when the Court finally ruled in effect that the power of Congress to regulate the currency could interfere with its borrowing power. This could be interpreted by irresponsible politicians to mean that the government could be sublimely free in pledging itself to unlimited amounts, because it could always depend on the currency power to pull it out of difficult situations.

The various measures adopted by the government, namely, the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May, 1933, authorizing the President to reduce the gold content of the dollar, the Joint Resolution of June, 1933, abrogating gold clauses in contracts, and the action of the President on Jan. 31, 1934, reducing the gold dollar from 25.8 grains to 15 5-21 grains, were all aimed, beyond question, at reducing the debt level. However, they did not constitute inflation in the economic sense of the word. Inflation means the increasing of the supply of the means of payment in relation to the demand for them, or, in other words, to the volume of goods in the market. Believing that the value of money depends on its metallic content, the administration expected that a cut in the gold content of the dollar would raise prices and permit debtors to pay off their debts. This would have taken place, if the cut in the dollar had led either to an increase in the money in circulation or to an increase in bank deposits. But the purchases of gold at steadily increasing prices which led up to the devaluation, were made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, not with cash but with the Corporation's own notes. Even though these notes could have been used as collateral for bank loans which would have resulted in an increase in bank note circulation or in bank deposits, comparatively little gold had been bought and the increase in the money circulation was too slight to affect prices to any noticeable degree. President Roosevelt himself finally admitted that the plan had failed. We might say that the devaluation was inflationary in spirit but not in method.

On the other hand, the Treasury's arbitrary appropriation of the sum of \$2,800,000,000 representing "profit" arising from the devaluation of the dollar, was potentially inflationary. With \$2,000,000,000 of it remaining in the stabilization fund, it is practically harmless at the present time, but the Secretary of the Treasury on Aug. 28, 1934 was reported to have stated frankly that this "profit" would ultimately be used to reduce the national debt. In that way, it may become actively inflationary. Whether the results will be disastrous or not depends on how and when and under what circumstances it will be used to reduce the debt. In fact, a move to use this "profit" has already been made. On March 11, 1935, an issue of gold certificates based on \$675,000,000 of it has been made to retire interest-bearing bonds against which national bank notes are outstanding. This naturally increases the bank reserves, but while it appears

to have the elements of inflation in it, the increase in the credit base is practically offset by the necessity of the national banks to retire the notes that had been issued against these bonds. As the gold certificates merely replace these bank notes, there will be no increase in currency circulation, at least, not immediately. However, the government is in a better position to borrow as a result, and if it does through the banks, there will be either an increase in currency circulation or in bank deposits.

When I say that the Court's decision with respect to government bonds might be regarded as unconsciously lending encouragement to the inflationists, I am not referring to the final denial of damages itself but to the reason for it. In fact, I believe that if the final judgment had been unfavorable to the government, the possibility of inflation would have been all the stronger. Federal gold clause securities outstanding have been estimated to be about \$14,565,000,000 (\$7,000,000,000 had been retired) and would have been increased by about \$15,000,000,000, if the government had been compelled to redeem them in dollars equivalent in amount to their gold value. While the total amount does not fall due at the same time, a substantial part falls due in the next few years. Increasing the public debt at this time, accompanied by an increase in interest charges, would, without question, bring us nearer to the danger of inflation. The result would either be increased taxation, or a greater strain placed on the public credit, or an immediate and possibly disastrous use of the "profit" in the stabilization fund. Recovery would then be still further retarded. Industry has at least been relieved from this uncertainty, but there is no indication that because this obstacle has been removed, it will leap ahead with unbridled optimism. There are too many other factors to be considered and industry is not showing any great eagerness to make long-range commitments.

In connection with the public debt, the \$40,000,000,000 of State, county and municipal indebtedness must not be overlooked. An adverse decision would have increased that burden by about \$28,000,000,000 and many of the local political subdivisions, almost near bankruptcy as we know, cannot afford to have their debts increased at this time without placing a greater burden on the taxpayers and jeopardizing their facilities for extending unemployment relief. As for the private obligations, which amount to about \$150,000,000,000 but which some people say run up to \$200,000,000,000, they would be increased by at least \$85,000,000,000. While all debts incurred prior to 1917, are now and have been through the depression payable in dollars of less purchasing power than those in which they were incurred, most of them were incurred during the war and the early part of the post-war period when prices were high and are now payable in dollars of greater purchasing power. All of the bonds, of course, do not mature at the same time, so there would

scarcely be any general financial disaster, if the decision had been unfavorable. Individual debtors, however, in many cases, would be seriously embarrassed, because not only would they be required to pay larger amounts when their bonds matured, but they would be compelled to pay increased interest charges out of incomes that had not increased. But then it must be pointed out that many of these debtors are also creditors holding gold bonds, and so while they might lose in one direction, they would gain in another. The country would be affected only to the extent that actual producers of wealth, whether they were industrial corporations, public utilities or railroads, were injured. Placing a greater burden on them at this time, which would curtail their credit or force them into receivership or bankruptcy, would definitely tend to retard recovery by curtailing production. But whatever value we may attach to the foregoing speculations should be considered in conjunction with this significant fact: If the stock market is to be taken as a reflection of business sentiment, the fact that the sharp gains, made immediately following the Supreme Court decisions, were soon wiped out and stocks declined to an even lower level, is an indication that business had not been materially checked by the uncertainty prevailing before the decisions were rendered.

Beyond the borders of our own country, the situation appears to be the same. While other nations were almost as vitally interested in the cogitations of our highest court as we were, the reaction was one of relief rather than one of enthusiastic hope or extreme gloom for the future. The uncertainty of the monetary situation has not been eliminated for them, because, as I mentioned previously, the liberal attitude of the Court has expanded the power of Congress to regulate the currency beyond anything that had ever been imagined before in this country. Therefore, from the foreign viewpoint, further devaluation of the dollar is an ever present possibility to stalk any effort at a restoration generally of the gold standard. But at least there was the feeling that there would be no immediate disturbance to the exchanges which would undoubtedly have followed an unfavorable decision.

However, there is no reason to suppose that stabilization of the currencies is any nearer merely because the decisions have averted immediate disaster. To think so is to ignore all other economic factors. Recovery is proceeding so slowly in these other countries that they are practically falling over one another in a greedy attempt to grab all of the foreign trade for themselves. At the same time, although trade is a mutual exchange of goods, they are trying to achieve this goal by shutting out each other's goods. In order to play this one-sided game, they elevate the monetary question to an exaggerated importance. Their aim is to export goods and to receive only gold which they bury in their vaults. Apparently they believe that they can become rich by sending goods

out of the country and taking none in. This in itself is sufficient reason why any return to the gold standard at this time or even in the near future is impossible. It tends to pile up gold in those countries that have been more successful than the others in restricting imports. Thus, France, in brutally raising her tariffs and quotas against foreign goods, has been accumulating huge reserves until now she has fully a hundred per cent gold cover for her currency. Such maldistribution of gold nullifies the gold standard as a workable system. It was the maldistribution of gold in connection with the war debts which the various creditor countries, particularly France and the United States, insisted had to be paid with gold and not with goods, that was largely responsible for the breakdown of the gold standard in the first place.

Such a policy is glaringly inconsistent. They want to increase their exports and at the same time to keep their large gold reserve intact. And so imports decline while exports increase, gold flows in and there they are sitting on top of their piles of gold trying to delude themselves into believing that they are prosperous. Then the exchange rate naturally turns in their favor, exports decline, imports increase, gold flows out and then they look with envious eyes at the cheaper currencies of other countries, wondering whether to manipulate their currencies downward or to raise their tariffs. And the impairment of their reserves also makes them tremble and so, in order to protect them and also their export trade, they resort to such devices as buying other currencies such as we are doing with our stabilization fund and England with her equalization fund. And so the silly process goes on and on, all due to the ignorance of fundamental economic principles. Now the recent sharp decline of the English pound has made the gold standard countries exceedingly jittery. This insane greed for gold springs from the superstition that the reserves have the power to infuse value into the currency, and the curious idea that exports are more beneficial than imports is a surviving relic of the English Mercantile Theory, according to which money was the only kind of wealth and the only way to grow rich was to exchange goods for money and not money for goods. The idea current in the world is that foreign trade offers an outlet for the surplus product of a country as though this surplus was made for any other purpose than as the cheapest means of supplying the country with the things it needs, in other words, to pay for imports.

As long as each country tries to obtain an advantage in trade by depressing its currency below its internal value, there will be no stabilization, and any hasty return to the gold standard will produce no permanent good. A necessary condition for real stabilization is more freedom of trade, and this no country is willing to meet. The Supreme Court decisions have left the world as it was, although from the academic standpoint, they have actually deepened the confusion.

## Legislative Advances

A bill has been introduced in the Massachusetts legislature providing for a tax on the economic rent of forest lands of the State. Mr. Lincoln Crowell of Sandwich and Mr. Richards appeared at a hearing of this bill before the committee on taxation. Messrs. Crowell and Richards were the only ones who appeared in favor of it and no one opposed it.

The Committee did not treat the bill simply as a bit of freak legislation. Possibly because Richards had recently appeared before them in opposition to a sales tax bill and they were therefore acquainted with him and recognized him as being sane.

The committee asked some pertinent questions and evinced interest in the bill. An incident that amused Mr. Crowell was when a legislator asked the meaning of economic rent, our tax commissioner, who by word and deed has never indicated any knowledge of Georgist philosophy, told the representative that he would have to read "Progress and Poverty" before he could understand the meaning of economic rent or the purpose of the bill.

Knowing Richards was from the Harvard enclave the committee questioned him concerning the success of the venture and appeared interested in the favorable report he was able to give them.

Part of the bill reads as follows:

The lease shall provide for payment to the town or city of the value in or on the ground of any non-renewable natural resource situated in or on the reserved land which is removed therefrom by the lessee or the agent of the lessee, within a year of the time of its removal. It shall provide, also, that so long as the classified reserved land is used exclusively for growing trees, its economic rent shall be the economic rent of the land for that purpose and that in the event of dispute regarding the amount of such economic rent, its amount shall be determined by the State Forester by means of the mathematical formulæ of forest valuation and the decision of the State Forester in that event shall be final.

It is rare indeed that the term "economic rent" appears in any proposed legislation as it does in the House Bill 420 of the Massachusetts legislature.

### MINNESOTA

A bill introduced in the Minnesota legislature provides as follows:

Section 1. All real and personal property subject to a general property tax, and not subject to any gross earnings or other lieu tax is hereby classified for purposes of taxation as follows:

Class I. All real estate exclusive of buildings or other improvements thereon. In assessing any tract or lot of real estate in which iron ore is known to exist, the assessable value of the ore, exclusive of the land in which it is located, and the assessable value of the land exclusive of the ore, shall be determined and set down separately, and the aggregate of the two shall be assessed against the tract or lot, and be considered within Class I as a unit.

Class II. All buildings and improvements on real estate and attached to and begin part of such real estate.

Class III. All other property within Section 1 and not included within Class I and Class II.

Section 2. For the years 1936 and 1937, all property included within Class I shall be valued and assessed at 60 per cent of the full and true value thereof, and for the years 1938 and 1939, all property included within Class I shall be valued and assessed at 80 per cent of the full and true value thereof, and for the year 1940 and thereafter, all property included within Class I shall be valued and assessed at 90 per cent of the full and true value thereof.

Section 3. All property included within Class II and Class III shall be assessed for the years 1936 and 1937 at 25 per cent of the full and true value thereof, and for the years 1938 and 1939, all property included within Class II and Class III shall be assessed at 15 per cent of the full and true value thereof, and for the year 1940 and there-

after, all property included within Class II and Class III shall be assessed at 10 per cent of the full and true value thereof.

### A FEDERAL MOVE

A bill recently introduced into the house by Representative Moritz, calls for a tax of one per cent on the privilege of land holding of a certain value. This is the old Keller bill which Judge Jackson H. Ralston prepared years ago, but with some important changes recently made in the preamble. These put the constitutionality of the proposition beyond any doubt.

From a national standpoint this bill may form a rallying-point

## Coshocton Tribune Proposes

What we propose is that all taxes be abolished, except one tax on the value of land, irrespective of the value of the improvement in or on the land.

This would not be a tax on real estate, because real estate includes improvements—buildings, fences, irrigation, ditches and so on. Thus, a man who buys a lot for \$500 and builds a \$25,000 home on it would be taxed just the same, under this plan, after he builds the house as he was before.

Nor is this plan a tax on land. There are thousands of acres of land in the United States which actually have no value at all, and would not be taxed. Most farm land has very little actual value, when improvements are deducted, and the taxes on most farmers would be less than under the present property taxes.

The plan involves the imposition of no new tax, since we already tax land values in taxing real estate. To carry it out, it would be necessary only to abolish all taxes except the tax on real estate, and to abolish all of that which now falls on buildings or improvements, leaving only that part of it which falls on the value of the bare land, increasing that so as to take as nearly as possible the whole of economic rent, or what is sometimes called the "unearned increment of land values."—Coshocton, (O.) *Daily Tribune*.

## Miscellany

### WISDOM FROM HORACE GREELEY

Eighty-five years ago today, Mr. Greeley was asked to speak before the journeymen printers of New York.

Referring to the depression then existing, Mr. Greeley lamented "that in this thriving commercial emporium of the New World, this trophy and pride of Christian civilization, there are at this day not less than 40,000 human beings anxious to earn the bread of honest industry but vainly seeking, and painfully, despairingly awaiting opportunity for so doing." Then he goes on to inquire.

"What can be the reason of this? Why is it that these 40,000 stronghanded, willing workers stand here thus fixed, enchained, in loathed, despairing idleness? Why are they compelled to wear out our pavements in hurrying hither and thither in anxious, heart-sick quest of something to do—with downcast looks and trembling voice, beseeching some fellow man to give them leave to labor for their bread?"

"I trust," Mr. Greeley says, "no one here gives any heed to the mumbling of self-styled political economists about overproduction and kindred phrases with which counsel is darkened. Overproduction of what? Where? Can there be overproduction of food when so many even in our midst, are suffering the pangs of famine? Overproduction of clothing and fabrics, while our streets swarm with men, women and children who are not half clad and who shiver through the night beneath the clothing they have worn by day? Overproduction of dwellings, when not half the families of our city have ade-

quate and comfortable habitations, not to speak of that large class whose lodgings are utterly incompatible with decency and morality?" But as to a dole the speaker simply said, "I have no faith in giving as a remedy for the woes of mankind."

Of that time, as now, Mr. Greeley said: "I have heard complaints that machinery and inventions do not work for the laboring classes, but rather against them." And he then made this additional observation (further using his precise words): "What the world eminently requires is some wise adjustment, some remodeling of the social machinery diminishing its friction, whereby every person willing to work shall assuredly have work to do."

SAM H. SEYMOUR, Chatanooga, Tenn., in *Herald-Tribune*.

#### A SLAP

Mr. Witt and Mr. Doty sincerely believe that they are Single Taxers, and we do not propose to dispute it. But the New Deal economic program leading inevitably to an increasing degree of state socialism, has had few more loyal supporters in Cleveland than Mr. Doty and Mr. Witt.

They and many other local Single Taxers have been doing some of the nearest intellectual somersaulting this town has seen, when they intersperse their Single Tax speeches with periodic huzzas and cheers for the New Deal and the Rooseveltian band wagon march toward state socialism. They would split their sides laughing at anyone who solemnly professed to be loyal at one and the same time to the political philosophies of Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt, but they profess loyalty at one and the same time to the Rooseveltian pattern of state socialism and the Henry George pattern of individualism, shielded against all forms of monopoly. The absurdity of being a New Dealer and a Single Taxer at the same time is apparent to anyone who had made even a casual study of the Georgian economics.

This is the slough of inconsistency and confusion in which most of the Cleveland Single Tax colony finds itself. But a few of them see clearly that the New Deal is not Single Tax, nor the Single Tax the New Deal, but rather that they tend to be the antithesis of each other. Such able Single Tax writers and publicists as Albert J. Nock, Francis Neilson and the Australian, Max Hirsch, have shown beyond question how the Georgian philosophy is poles removed from any trace of state socialism. The official Single Tax magazine, *LAND AND FREEDOM*, has been a most uncompromising critic of the New Deal.—DALE COX, columnist in Cleveland *Plain Dealer*.

#### THE ECONOMICS OF TODAY

The schools of economic thought now dominating the nation and the world are the greatest obstacle to sound economic recovery because they are without any guiding moral principle. Their judgments of measures do not turn upon the question of whether they are right or wrong, just or unjust, but upon the question of their expediency, and their Bible seems to be the Book of the Holy Statistics.

Does this judgment seem harsh? I leave it to you. Last summer a number of eminent reputed economists held a get-together meeting in New York to iron out their differences and present to the world some semblance of a united and coherent front. And the very first article in their new confession of faith was that

"Economics can consider only facts and their relations. It cannot concern itself with political, religious, racial, social or ethical considerations."

Not concern itself with ethical considerations? If a science of human relations is not to concern itself with ethical considerations, what kind of a science is it, and what is it worth to humanity?

It was a greater economist than any who walks the earth today who said:

"Fret not about the morrow, saying what shall we eat, what shall

we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed. Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things will be added unto you."

#### SCIENCE OF ABOMINATIONS

I assert that the so-called science of economics taught in high places today is a science of abominations from which the spirit of truth and righteousness is conspicuously absent. That there are truths in it I will not deny, but they are so detached, disjointed and fragmentary that by themselves they are of little worth. As a whole, the dismal science clearly comes under Isaiah's condemnation:

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.

"Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst."

Whether we regard the Bible as the literally inspired word of God or merely a compilation of the wisdom of the ancients, there can be no doubt that there is in that book wisdom of the highest and deepest significance which the world has discarded as of no value—wisdom which the churches themselves have not even tried to keep alive and vibrant.

From an address by STEPHEN BELL in Paterson, N. J., at the Alexander Hamilton Hotel before 100 bankers of Passaic County.

## Correspondence

#### AS TO INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Let us forget nominal money (circulating medium) for a little while.

Roughly (enough for all practical purposes), interest is the wages of the producers of capital goods.

Interest and wages rise together. That is, the wages of the producers of capital goods rise with the wages of the producers of consumers goods. Otherwise, the production of capital goods would cease. Because competition would pull the producers of capital goods into the field of the producers of consumers goods.

A complete and comprehensive definition of interest is difficult to give. And for all practical purposes it is not necessary.

Back to nominal money:

In a complex society, which is also a free economic state, money-interest is subject to the higgling and jiggling of the market, and will quickly arrive at a point of just equilibrium.

In a free economic state interest can never be exploitation.

This is the crux of the whole matter: Interest can never be exploitation in a free economic state.

Peoria, Ill.

ALBERT HENNIGES.

#### MR. LUXTON ANSWERS HIS CRITICS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am impressed with Hiram Loomis's remarks as to my failure to add anything to the clearing up of the confusion in men's minds as to the meaning of interest and money. That shows very loose thinking on the part of Mr. Loomis. I did not start out to clear up the matter, but nevertheless I did. Except for the slip of calling interest the return for the use of someone else's wealth my definition of interest will stand. It is usually some other person's wealth, but actually it is any wealth used as capital, no matter to whom it belongs. I placed money where it belongs when I said that it is one of the things invented by man to assist him in production.

He does not see the point of my remarks about "biological entity." He does not know that I wished to show that Frank Stevens was worrying needlessly about a perfectly natural state of affairs. But nowhere did I say that truth must cater to the idiosyncracies of the human mind. There can be no compromise with truth. There-

fore why should we argue with Socialists and others who change the meaning of the terms several times in a discussion? It is too bad that Mr. Loomis does not understand that in our evolution most men are still less rational than savages. Those who are slightly more rational than their fellows are those who do the exploiting, cheating, lying, stealing. Those who are more rational, and at the same time just, are still but a small voice crying in the wilderness, but taking a large view of humanity from earliest times I am convinced that we are fulfilling our biologic destiny and are approaching slowly the ideal man.

Mr. Loomis quotes Henry George to show that the selling price will not be destroyed by Single Tax. It is of no concern to me what authorities are quoted. Let us look at the facts. All land held out of use now is so held with the expectation of selling at a price. All land underdeveloped is also so held. The price expected is the highest price possible. Single Tax will certainly destroy such selling prices. Such selling prices presuppose several bidders for the land. The bidders are actuated by what they conceive to be the future demand for the land. In many cases this is pure gambling, but there are many cases in which an astute student of the trend of commerce and industry can foresee future conditions. When the holding of the land has become unprofitable because the economic rent is collected by society for social purposes no selling price will exist, since to fail to pay the economic rent would mean an ouster by the state and no man will want to pay more than the economic rent, which he would be doing if he paid some one for the privilege of taking over the land from him. To hold land then will mean to use it. To hold it idle will mean to pay for it out of wealth accumulated elsewhere. To cease to pay the economic rent will mean that one must give it up.

Now in a circumstance where a person wants a very select spot for a home or a camp and someone else is there already and is satisfied to pay the economic rent, there will arise a situation which might give weight to Mr. Loomis's contention. If the one who wants it badly enough is willing to pay the incumbent a large sum to give it up to him we might think that the sum agreed upon is a selling value of the land. But is it? Is the incumbent holding the land to collect tribute from a future buyer? The fact that he pays his economic rent for a piece of land which is not used in the production of material wealth shows that he is not holding it for that purpose. He is getting a psychic income, rest, recreation, pleasure, satisfaction of his artistic sense, a chance to revel in nature and its joys, and health of body and mind. To ask him to give up these benefits to another who wishes them for the same reasons would be unthinkable without some suitable recompense for their loss. He must forego all these comforts for a while until he can locate a place as near suitable as possible. He must have the annoyance of picking up and vacating, tear himself up by the roots, as it were. Any sum the other is willing to pay must be as equal to the comforts given up and the inconvenience suffered as is possible to compute. If he is willing to pay such a sum, and the incumbent is willing to take it, is this really the selling value of the land? No. And what is more it might be many times the value computed by capitalizing the economic rent at five per cent, depending upon how desirous the purchaser is to get it, and how desirous the incumbent is to stay. It is not the selling value of the land. It is the sum paid by one man to another to give up certain satisfactions. It does not depend upon any supply and demand in cases where others are also bidding. In this case the bidder is limited to one person but there are other parcels of land which he might have.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

#### A TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. RAND

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Will you spare space for a brief tribute to a veteran Single Taxer, who for nearly fifty years quietly, tirelessly and effectively preached the gospel of equality, of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as taught by Henry George?

It was at the Anti-Poverty Fair in 1887 that I first met Frank P. Rand, who was born in Maine.

In 1898 I was in Kansas City and met him again.

In 1907 when I went to Seattle, Frank P. Rand was there quiet as ever, effective, and tireless in preaching the gospel.

In 1913 I found him again, in Victoria, British Columbia, still quiet and still busy, in season and out of season.

Always ready to talk Single Tax himself he could not believe anyone else would hesitate anywhere or at any time.

In Victoria he came to me and said "You are to talk Single Tax from the stage at the Princess Theater during the performance next Monday night."

Astonished, I said "What do you mean? An audience pays to see and hear a play, they won't sit quiet to hear some one but in with a Single Tax talk."

He said "You needn't talk very long, but you'll have to talk. I arranged it with the management. They are playing 'Shore Acres' and I told them you were a friend of James A. Herne who wrote it, and whose acting made it famous. The actor who takes Herne's part will call on you in the dinner scene and you'd better sit in the front row, and be ready." So obediently, I climbed over the foot lights, talked Single Tax briefly and escaped alive. Next day Rand called on me and said "You are to talk next Thursday night at the house warming of the new Congregational Church." I went and had a delightful evening with a very fine bunch of people. There was no chance for any Single Taxer to loaf or get rusty with Frank P. Rand. around. He was always willing to sacrifice anyone to advance the Single Tax. Now for him "Out of the darkness has stretched a hand and into the silence has come a voice, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of the Lord.'" Bolar, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

#### WE SHOULD BE REPRESENTED AT CONFERENCES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

One thing bothers me tremendously.

Everywhere there are committees and commissions and individuals making investigations and reports on the tax question, and proposals and notions and bills without number are published and introduced, many of them senseless and unjust. But hardly anywhere is the land value tax proposed or considered—the only just and practical of them all.

Why should it not be possible to have an able representative of the Single Tax plan represented at some of these meetings and conferences? Alma, Wis.

THEODORE BUEHLER

#### MR. STEWART RETURNS AGAIN TO THE CHARGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My letter "As to Interest," in your Jan.-Feb. issue with Mr. Kendal's on "Some Practical Aspects of Interest" and "Note by the Editor," submitted that "The actual identifying of Single Tax with continuance of the present certain interest burden is killing its natural broad appeal;" and that natural law facts call for our standing simply on the law of supply and demand as determining interest.

As we are certainly concerned about the slow progress of Single Tax this is a proper matter to "worry" about. The fact that whatever interest there will be under Single Tax must be natural and just, has no bearing on the present importance of knowing and teaching the truth as to what it will be instead of wrongly antagonizing those whom we must convert to it in order to get it. Teaching that everybody will have capital and get interest—perhaps from the unfortunate and improvident who do not count,—simply cannot help even if it satisfies us to let it go at that.

We all agree that diverted-rent unjustly enters into "the present certain interest burden," giving it such certainty as natural values alone can give; that so far as the vote is determined by relative scarcity of capital (however normally caused) it is just and beneficial

to both parties. We also agree that nothing else than Single Tax is needed to make it just.

What is the disagreement, and how does it matter? The answers are: (1) Simply as to prognostications about what will actually enter into this automatically—just interest that Single Tax will secure; and (2) The effect of wrong prognostications in killing acceptance of the Single Tax remedy. This killing effect demands careful determination of the natural law facts on which our prognostications should rest. Henry George wanted no blind following; he and we want his remedy.

George based everything on natural laws,—on which all sciences must be based. He adopted interest as a natural law factor because he thought that natural values (of reproduction) entered into it as "the result of added efficiency due to capital." He found this "added efficiency" theory untrue and unjust in its application to tools, but failed to find that reproduction values are subject to the same natural laws of distribution which apply to other products. He qualified his statement that "wages and interest must rise together" by adding—"The interest ratio with wages being fixed by the net power of increase which attaches to capital." If natural laws permit none of this increase to go to capital, so that wages rise alone, then the complete science which he based on the natural values attaching to land is merely simplified.

When the diverted-rent which now falsely enters into present interest is eliminated by Single Tax, will any other natural value (that is value apart from individual labor) enter into it? If it will, to that extent it will be "the certain interest burden" we now have,—supporting such obligations as the "Perpetual Income Bonds" mentioned. If not it will inflict no such burden. Primarily we can and should determine the facts as to this. If natural laws distribute generally the natural values attaching to things, just as Single Tax will distribute the natural values attaching to land, we should know it and teach it, for it will remove a killing stigma from our cause. Nothing else can continue the menace of our present false interest.

Mr. Kendal refers to the moral theory that "it is not permissible for one man to do no labor and another labor to pay him interest," as requiring testing; and this is certainly true as to the moral theory that "equity demands a return to the lender;" or that "added efficiency due to the use of capital belongs to capital." The important truth is that natural law facts furnish the proper test; for it cannot be questioned if we concede natural law morality, and that the facts are revealed to us "by ordinary observation."

We know that if "everybody" had capital (labor products—not "spurious"), the lender could demand little, and perhaps might have to pay for the safe keeping of his unused wealth. If the potential lender could convert his wealth into ownership of tools, or cattle etc., so as to secure their natural values, we would have to provide against such ownerships being monopolized. With natural laws actually distributing these values, Single Tax needs no supplementing,—it is "enough;" *the now plausible basis for Socialism, Communism, New Dealing—the fight against "Capitalism"—will be undermined.*

There is real urge on LAND AND FREEDOM and all Single Taxers to know and tell the truth as to this. Whatever else enters into true interest cannot make it unjust any more than the "profits and loss" of business enterprise can be unjust so long as they are subject to free competition, but we must appreciate that mere "somehow" theories are of no value.

Reading, Pa.

WALTER G. STEWART.

#### A NEW ENTHUSIAST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to congratulate you on your editorials in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

I am entirely in agreement with the letter of Robert S. Doubleday suggesting the observance of a Henry George day instead of the congress. This would make Sept. 2, the first such observance and plans should be started immediately. The large individual meetings

in important cities should have good speakers and their talks should be broadcast on a large hookup over the nation, thus more or less bringing all the meetings into contact with one another and serving the purpose of a single congress as well as doing much more good for the cause in general.

The letters of A. C. Campbell and A. Lawrence Smith were interesting to me as I believe in getting some concerted action. In the case of Mr. Smith's letter, I think that the "spot" to shoot the birdshot at is Washington, not some State or other. If you are going to bring down an eagle the best place to hit him is in the head or body, not a wing, a foot or tailfeathers! Let's hit this problem right on the head. I think that the work being done in California is great stuff and more power to Judge Ralston.

Radio is now the most effective means of advertising and the most powerful factor in forming public opinion. Partisan newspapers can suppress news but the radio can't. An advertisement in a paper is hidden away inside but a radio programme is on the FRONT PAGE with a streamer headline across the top. A national network programme cannot be missed in a single city, town or village in the country. There are millions of radio listeners. That is the key to our success. If the newspapers want to follow, O.K. Ignore those that don't, they won't be popular. The Hearst chain will be against it for W. R. Hearst has thousands of acres of land. Will Rogers will be against it for his hobby and sideline is land speculation. The brain trust will be "agin" us for the same reason (see Chas. B. Rogers' letter in Jan.-Feb. LAND AND FREEDOM). These opponents will be the biggest feathers in our campaign caps! They are some of the very monopolizers we will turn the people against in wrath. We will dig up the facts about how much land they have and expose every one of them. The people are going to tire very soon of all the sickly hit-and-miss fallacious palliatives and panaceas and the "frank experiments" of the administration. They are going to be sick of the patent medicine and want to perform a real surgical operation on our system to find the real trouble and cut it out and sew it up tight!

O.K. then. The line forms on the right. Lets get organized on the double-quick and get this job done.

I just read Frank Chodorov's wonderful article in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. I therefore appoint him CHIEF HIGH MASTER OF PROPAGANDA, without even consulting him about it. He said that the leader will probably be crucified. If that is meant to scare, I'm not scared for I don't believe it. I therefore appoint myself CAMPAIGN MANAGER and will step aside for a vote when we get organized. Now it is up to somebody to appoint someone as TREASURER and at the same time to have him appoint a COLLECTOR (or two) OF INTERNAL REVENUE. By "internal revenue" I mean contributions, to get this started, from members already in the movement. If we can't get their support in DOING something then we had better forget Single Tax and go jump in the river.

I hope my enthusiasm will prove contagious. You see I am an aviator and an aviator is either QUICK or dead. Let's be quick before we're dead. I am also a reserve officer in the Marines. As a Marine I believe in ACTION. So let's have some QUICK ACTION! South Egremont, Mass.

JOHN M. MILLER.

#### INTEREST VIEWED BY A NEW ZEALANDER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The discussions that arise in connection with the validity of interest are becoming more numerous than has been the case in the past. Even Single Tax journals are printing controversies on the subject, and many followers of Henry George, of whom I am one, gravely question the right of any man, his heirs and assigns, to "sit down" and draw interest on his capital, *ad infinitum*.

This letter has been inspired by the reading of the discussion between Frank Stephens and John Luxton in your Nov.-Dec. issue. The latter defends interest on the plea that a lender of wealth is en-

titled to receive "a return" for the wealth he has placed at the disposal of the borrower, a proposition that no one, much less any Single Taxer, would be likely to deny. It has not occurred to Mr. Luxton that a lender may obtain "a return" without receiving any interest. Yet, that he may do so is easily demonstrated. If we think in terms of wealth instead of money, the position will be clarified. I contend that the making good of depreciation is "a return," and I believe it is the only return that can be justly claimed. If more is obtained there will always be those who can live on indefinitely in idleness, a condition which all Single Taxers should agree would be one of parasitism, and *ipso facto* contrary to justice which is the foundation of their creed.

If a man, who wears out a suit of clothes a year, makes himself twenty suits, these will not last him twenty years. The first will last a year, the second a little less, and the whole stock will clothe him for (say) nineteen and one-half years only. The odd half year is lost in depreciation. Now if he lends nineteen of the suits conditionally on receiving a *new* suit every year until the loan is repaid, it is clear that the wealth he created in the first instance will clothe him for the full twenty years so, although there is no *interest*, he still gets "a return" for his loan.

Mr. Luxton thinks he clinches the argument with his typewriter illustration, but his is not the last word. Suppose the owner of the machine has no present use for it and by loaning it obtains the return of the machine intact as it was when he lent it, has he not received "a return"? Would not the machine have suffered depreciation even if he had not loaned it? In this case a payment would have to be made to the lender to cover the invisible depreciation which it is impossible to make good by repair, but still there would be no *interest*. Supporters of interest invariably picture the lender as depriving himself of something that is indispensable to himself or his work, but the fact is that loans are usually made out of surplus wealth, represented, of course, by money. The key to the interest question lies, I think, in the system that turns perishable wealth into "imperishable" money, and thus places "capital" on the same permanent basis as land. The enormous wastage resulting from depreciation is thus camouflaged. If a man lends a machine worth £1,000 he gets "a return" until the machine is worn out; after that nothing at all. If he turns the machine into money and lends the £1,000 he gets "a return" for all time, under present conditions. The plain English of this is that after a certain limited period of time he, his heirs and assigns, levy pure tribute on current production, giving nothing in return, and are therefore mere parasites on the community.

Nevertheless I hold that nothing needs to be done about interest, other than the Socialization of Rent. The interest rate depends on supply and demand. George's plan would greatly increase the supply of wealth (and capital), a point I need not stress amongst Single Taxers, while it would, I believe, wholly eliminate the demand for loans. Our philosophy teaches that land-owners appropriate all surplus wealth, thus creating a "corner" in capital or money. The socialization of rent would prevent such appropriation, leaving the whole product of labor in the hands of the laborers. There would then be no need for the producers of wealth (capital and money) to borrow capital; they would use their own. Interest would thus die a natural death.

This is not to say that interest, in the sense of the added production which the use of capital gives, would be eliminated, but merely that the added production would go to labor as wages, instead of to idlers as interest. Interest in its economic sense must persist and grow with the advance of science, invention, organization etc., that is not in question; what is in question is the equitable distribution of what is somewhat loosely called the "national income."

Our case will be much stronger when we discard the defense of mere interest receivers. Socialists cry out against "rent, interest and profits." Profits are merely rent and (or) interest, so that our system, if I am correct, would give them all they ask, without the need of socialistic "planning," regimentation, dictatorship, etc. The

man in the street leans to socialism because he sees no difference between the interest receiver and the rent receiver. If we can convince him that the application of the Henry George plan will give to labor its full product we should get his support. We must fail in this if we sanction the receipt of interest by people who do no work.

I see a change in the attitude of most Single Taxers, and all Single Tax journals, in the direction of putting a question mark against interest, and believe the time will soon come when we will be united on this point, and show that George builded even better than he knew.  
Auckland, N. Z. C. H. NIGHTINGAL 3.

## SINGLE TAX CONFERENCES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your criticism of the Single Tax Congresses has evidently started something. The current issue of LAND AND FREEDOM marks a very necessary manicuring of Single Tax intellects throughout the Georgist movement. It all recalls my early attempts, made many years ago, to have Single Taxers put salesmanship, business methods and organization into the Single Tax programme. It all emphasizes my recent unsuccessful attempt to again organize the Single Taxers of Massachusetts.

Personally I agree with you that a definite, business-like programme be laid down, upon which Single Taxers might well concentrate their time, money and efforts. Unfortunately, we are in the same predicament which came upon the constructors of the tower of Babel. In attempting to erect the Georgist temple of justice we find ourselves defeated by a multiplicity of notions, a great divergence of opinions, a variety of schemes, and an army of self-appointed leaders. Nothing could be sweeter for the vested interests. The monopolists do not need to give us a "licking;" we are defeating ourselves.

It all simmers down to the uncomfortable fact that ninety-five per cent of us are naught but philosophical anarchists. With most of us Single Tax is merely a subject for debate in parlors and other places where the limelight of attention may be played upon our anaemic faces as we harangue a handful of listeners. With some of us Single Tax is an excuse for attending luncheons at which the physical appetite is surreptitiously satisfied under the guise of feeding the mental appetite upon principles of justice. With a few of us Single Tax is a subterfuge for getting away from home and "taking a trip" to a conference, a congress, a "meetin'."

It is my conviction that most Single Taxers are simply lazy when it comes to working any muscles of their anatomy except those of their jaws. Show me any Single Tax organization and I'll show you one or two human horses in that association who are carrying all the load insofar as real work is concerned. The rest of the outfit invariably limits its activities to profound and puerile chatter and to the finding of jobs and programmes in which some one else does all the work. It is always a case of "let George do it."

Single Taxers simply cannot do team work. It is contrary to their eternal struggle for individual economic freedom, and this fundamental idea is so ingrained in their every thought that organization and cooperation, or any other form of limitations upon individualism, is repugnant to their pet theories. They have yet to learn that the very goal which they now seek through diversified channels and contrary notions cannot be attained except through organization and concentrated effort—unless, of course, the Creator steps in and establishes Single Tax in spite of us anarchistic Single Taxers.

Too few Single Taxers are willing to do the menial tasks of mixing mortar or carrying bricks to the foundation walls of the Economic Temple, except when it can be done within the depths of a cushioned easy-chair adjacent to a warm radiator or in a hammock under the shade of a sheltering tree.

As one of your correspondents has pointed out, those who attend congresses and conferences probably would not spend the same amount of money for other Single Tax purposes if said congresses were discontinued. However, there remains no valid reason why congresses



and conferences should not lay down a programme of business-like procedure and actually make progress to the very necessary goal of establishing social justice. If this were done, as you have very properly suggested, the number in attendance at congresses would soon dwindle to the very few who are really willing to get down to brass tacks and go to work. The actual working-ability of congressional orators and spellbinders is very easily discovered by assigning these gentlemen to committee work where actions, not words, are in order. This procedure would, of course, take all the glamor out of attending congresses and we could not then make speeches nor read papers, the recording of which might some day awaken a sense of pride in our great-great grandsons when they read what a prominent part their grandpops played in the Single Tax Congress, or in the Hicksville Single Tax Club, 'way, 'way back in 1934.

Homes, factories, skyscrapers, etc., are made by laying brick on brick, driving nail after nail, threading pipe after pipe, sawing plank after plank, etc., all done under centralized authority and systematic procedure. Workers with contrary schemes, plans or purposes are promptly fired. Buildings cannot be successfully constructed in any other manner; nor can the Temple of Economic Justice be erected in a contrary fashion, unless, of course, the Creator knocks our anarchistic heads together and does the job Himself.

It has been wisely said that "Those who can, DO; those who can't CHATTER."

More power to your pungent pen.  
Fall River, Mass.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

#### DOMINANCE OF WEALTH IN GOVERNMENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The article by Frank Chodorov in Jan.-Feb. number of LAND AND FREEDOM, to my mind, is one of the finest specimens of logical reasoning which I have met in many a day. It might be epitomized in the simple statement that the Geogist philosophy has been handicapped by "respectability" and that no leader of a Moses-calibre has risen to carry it to triumph in its complete and uncompromising form. My own impatient soul, longing for that "kingdom of heaven," urges me to say "amen." Then arises that kindly angel—Natural Law—gently warning me, "Not so hasty, my little man."

Never must we ignore the fact of the invariableness of Natural Law. Under that law we are taught that heaven is not gained by a single bound, theological offers to the contrary notwithstanding. He who is rescued from the glaring sun of a blazing desert must pass through gradual stages toward normal light. Else all is surrounding darkness. Or, to reverse the figure, after one has known naught but darkness, suddenly to be plunged into the brilliant light of midday, is to be blinded. So it is with mankind. He who has known nothing but tyranny must grow into the blessings of freedom before he may understand the grandeur of Liberty. Nature herself restrains the hasty step, because she would build her structures without flaw that we may withstand the storms of time.

We must distinguish between a compromise of principle and the details through which we must realize the fruits of it. All human progress, all individual advancement, civilization itself, is accomplished by everlasting compromises regarding the details of achievement. But all progress is stopped when we compromise with principle. This was well illustrated in the course of Lincoln as expressed in his letter to Horace Greeley. His one aim was to save the Union. If, day by day, he saw that might best be achieved by this or that policy, he did not hesitate to shift the policy. (I wish our present President could realize this.) We must advance beyond error before we can realize it for what it was. Polity must be held sacred. Policies through which it may be realized may shift with the current of common thought.

Truth has a cunning way of insinuating its spirit into the heart of all things. The heart of them is the soil in which that spirit thrives.

There it grows, it expands, and, like the tender vine that finds a crevice in the solid rock, bursts its environment to find the light of day.

Throughout all history, wealth has been the dominant power in government and all social order. I do not deprecate that fact. It is right and just that this be so. My only quarrel is that they who have, through special laws and privileges, secured that wealth, constitute just a minority of mankind. Having it, that minority has dominated the enactment of laws and their administration of government. It has grown by what it fed on. Human rights—which means natural rights—it has trampled under foot, until, even the trampled-upon (or, as an Irish friend calls them, "the submerged tenth") seem to think that such is heaven-ordained. Hardly attempting to rise from beneath the feet that press them down, they peek about in worship of the power that oppresses them. They praise those above them, for "giving them work"—as if "work" is the want of man. Poor sodden mass! But, at least, the majority of those above them know that they are oppressors. Therefore are they guilty, not so much in taking what is surrendered to them, but in false instructions to the underlings and in their cruel determination to maintain the fiendish system through which their diabolical cruelties are effective. The relentless hand of Natural Justice always has and always will, in time, scoop up that parasitical group and hurl it into oblivion.

Now, if the "submerged tenth"—which in fact is about ninety per cent of the population—are willing to persist in their own ignorance, Nature is no more disposed to spare them from the effect of their own stupidity than she is to spare the leaches who suck their blood. They must learn—leaches and leached alike—that the highest obligation of life is to be intelligent. Then to be intelligent, intelligence will see to it that every form of privilege is stamped from out our social life. When that desired event shall have arrived, men will understand that Nature gives to toil, and to toil alone, her boundless riches. Beggars and thieves—both above and below the crust—will be no more. Cunning shall no longer thrive at the expense of MANHOOD. Wealth, created by toil and enterprise, will be in the hands of its creators. Being in the hands of the many, its force still will dominate the making of laws, together with their interpretation and administration. Then shall LIBERTY prevail over all.

Yes, I agree with Mr. Chodorov, that, to realize this happy state, a Moses must arrive, for it must always be that the mass of men will follow the strong, the masterful. But, when all is said, this truth shall remain: That unless the followers be intelligent, their lack of it will mean—as it did with the Moses of that other day—that their leader shall not himself reach the promised land, and with his personal failure so to do, neither shall the followers—again as of old—realize the glory of his dreams. Or, as in the case of the later Nazarene, lacking intelligence, they buried the beauty of His teachings under the debris of superstition and theology, making His crucifixion endure through the ages.

Let me repeat: The highest individual and social, moral and ethical obligation of life is to be intelligent.  
Hollywood, Calif.

Laurie J. Quinby.

#### THE DISADVANTAGES OF OUR NAME

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The Single Tax is a means to a very desirable end. But the end is the important thing. The chief end to be attained is the Abolition of Landlordism. I suggest for consideration and discussion the question whether we should not emphasize "Abolition of Landlordism" more and Single Tax less.

When human slavery was the major political question in this country the discussion was direct, and on the question of Abolition of Slavery. Everybody knew precisely what the argument was about; and it is putting it mild to say that the argument was full of life and electricity. But to those who have not studied the Single Tax, and they are the great mass of voters, it is just another kind of tax more or less irritating than what we have.

We have all heard those foolish performances called a "Single Tax Debate." The debaters on either side may make all kinds of unwarranted assertions, and ninety-five per cent of the audience will not know fact from fiction. The debater with the best voice and manner, and most pleasing street argument about preserving the great American Home, always wins in the opinion of the average audience. It requires some elementary knowledge of fundamental economics to judge the merits of a Single Tax argument. And that is something not possessed by the average voter any more than by the average editor. A street argument on the Single Tax is mere confusion. It is much the same with most Single Tax lectures to the average audience.

But write on your banner "Abolition of Landlordism," and run your banner to the top of the highest flagstaff, and I think you can stir up the enemy. It is such stirring up of the enemy that will stir up the friends of justice. "Abolish Landlordism" will have a real and definite meaning to the man in the street. It may not be the true meaning, but he will be put on active inquiry. The best means of abolishing landlordism will follow in proper order.

Oshkosh, Wis.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

#### FROM THE EDITOR OF LAND AND LIBERTY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I noticed today your quip at "Townsend" and you will be interested in the February *Land and Liberty* article on him. He may be daft but his daftness is no madder than the schemes that the politicians are putting over everywhere in the name of national policy. If a Townsend did not exist, decent nature would have to produce him in order that all those policies should be ridiculed out of court.

As I write, here comes a letter from Mr. Crowell of Sandwich, Mass., who is interested in one of the extension classes under the auspices of the Henry George School of Social Science in New York. He asks if "Progress and Poverty" has been translated into Finnish. The answer is YES and I am sending Mr. Crowell the brochure of the translations we got out in 1910, to which however sundry additions have since been made—such as the Dutch translation of "Protection or Free Trade" and new Spanish translations of everything. From Australia I had inquiry for the French translation; from another country for a Japanese translation (not existing) and the other day came an air-mail letter from Burma all in a hurry from two able scholars there who are translating the book into Burmese. Still another correspondent, this time from Bagdad, writes he is busy translating one or more of the addresses (and I think "Progress and Poverty") into Arabic.

Are these "straws in the wind?" I think there is more than that in it. Judging by our own experience and the immense amount of correspondence that reaches us from all parts—the kind of correspondence that calls for information, for answers to questions, for explanatory literature, with reports of local activities—the movement is marching along in very good health and confidence. And here we have to deal also with letters, journals and reports in many languages—German, Danish, French, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese and sometimes Norwegian. When it comes to Russian and Magyar and Bulgarian, we are stumped. As to such matters, it has been a great compliment to know that that Russian article of mine has been translated and published in Danish, Spanish and Bulgarian.

London, England.

A. W. MADSEN.

#### FROM ONE OF THE AUTHORS OF "UTOPIA DAWNS"

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your review (Jan.-Feb. issue) of John Pratt Whitman's "Utopia Dawns," have you not missed the important point that this author has sketched in his own Utopia, in chapter twelve, a society in which the Henry George principles are put into practice? Here every citizen obtains his land from the Central Council, and builds his house on his life-time lease, paying no taxes. Out of this basis the good

things of Utopia grow. You say you do not like Utopias but they stir the imagination of the people who want *Progress without Poverty*. Why not use every possible chance of stirring people to action? Neither the Single Tax principle nor Utopia can be said to be yet realized on the earth but the ideas have to come first, do they not? Boston, Mass.

ELEANOR WOOD WHITMAN.

#### REFUSES TO TREMBLE BEFORE THIS FRANKENSTEIN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Perhaps I am just a trifle dull; not apt enough to recognize a "problem" when I meet it; for to my mind all this tempest in a teapot (I say this with diffidence) concerning this problem, interest, is conjured out of such stuff "as dreams are made of." A very proper subject, to be sure, to engage the valor of Socialists and NRA champions and their ilk *ad nauseum*, but scarcely a matter for debate between men who have knowledge of the *science of economics*.

Is it, or is it not, true that there are three factors concerned in the production of wealth, or are there but two? If the former, is one of these factors, one of the partners in the enterprise, if you will, to secure a lesser and lesser proportion of the product while each of the others receives more and more until his share reaches the point of extinction? If so, I cannot comprehend why he shall consent to stay in the firm; I should think the poor fellow would withdraw and set up for himself. If the latter, why keep up the fiction longer? If Friday, fashioning nets, spades, slings, while Crusoe fishes, digs and hunts is to get no part of the increased fruits of Crusoe's labor I cannot exactly understand how he is going to keep on making them, nor why he should consent to do so if he could accept that he acquiesce in his status of slave and be content to take what will keep him alive so he may serve his master.

Surely Mr. Stewart's Frankenstein monster which makes \$20,000 "the equivalent of a never-dying live worker is of the nature of those horrid monsters, half serpent and half man with which our childhood Bibles were embellished to frighten the unrepentant sinner unto righteousness, meningeal vapors from a poorly digested dinner, mayhap. Is capital indestructible that its growth is never arrested until, on this hypothesis, it must finally swallow the earth? Then let us join the Socialists in their ceaseless attack upon so portentous an enemy. Have we, indeed, at last discovered immortality and find it attached to the products of our own hands?

I have to have cars (Fords, to be sure), in which to get about to do my work; and would you believe it, they just keep wearing out. I want to be put wise as to where I can get hold of this self-perpetuating capital. I shall be glad to contract, tomorrow, with some capitalist at eight per cent on the price of a car, I to take care of all upkeep and he merely to furnish me a new car when this is worn out and upon the same terms. And I shall save many good dollars over my present necessity of buying new cars with my own money.

I suspect that this terrible Frankenstein is born of the illusion that money is capital (It is pretty difficult to get rid of this child of our early "education"), when in fact it isn't capital at all, and no one would pay interest to get it except that it is a recognized draft upon the wealth he proposes to secure with it and for which wealth he is glad to pay interest because in using this wealth, which becomes his capital, he will have more wealth of his own after paying this interest than he could produce without it. I have heard of no Georgist who proposes, when this reform has been accomplished, to compel men to borrow whether they think they shall profit by it or not. Men refrain from borrowing if they find they do not need to do so. And if one employ one's own capital instead of borrowing, is there any crucial issue at stake whether he decompose his earnings into wages and interest or lumps them together as total income? The assessor will not then be prying into the matter.

Your columns of Comment and Reflection are the choicest draught I get from the feast of good things found in every issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. I can put away the other articles to a more convenient season, but I have to read these first choice pages as soon as I get

the cover off your never disappointing collection of gems. The immortal Omar's "book of verses" could not have out-sparked them. Marathon, Iowa.

T. J. KELLY, M. D.

### THE STATE WHERE CULTURE REIGNS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Some forty years ago I had the two last years of Henry George's *Standard* carefully bound in one volume and appropriately identified with gold letters and then presented same to the public library of Northborough, Mass., having confidence that that was the safest possible place for what would come to be valued more highly year by year. Northborough was my boyhood home and the library was an excellent one. Recently the library generously agreed that this volume might be forwarded to the Henry George School of Social Science in New York. Your readers will readily understand that the hundred and four issues of the *Standard* contained numerous contributions from Henry George together with a graphic story of the Single Tax movement in the early days, all of which rendered priceless value to this volume. But it then developed that the State of Massachusetts had sent to the library in Northborough an "efficiency expert" to weed out such matter as might be eliminated and therefore this volume had by the customary intelligence of "efficiency experts" been thrown away. This should be a warning to everyone to place no faith in public libraries of Massachusetts or other States where "efficiency experts" are employed.

Wichita, Kan.

HENRY WARE ALLEN.

### A BILL IS PENDING IN CONGRESS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I may have submitted the following query to you before; I am not sure. If I have done so I have not in any event had your answer.

What specific and effective thing can the present Federal Administration do to stop the diversion of economic rent into private channels and how could it go about doing it?

It is easy enough to find fault with the administration, and it is easy enough for the administration to drift into Socialistic practices. Mistakes are always easily made. But how can the Federal Administration do the right thing and the needed thing at this time.

Newton D. Baker tells me the administration cannot constitutionally do anything that he knows of looking toward the collection of economic rent.

Tacoma, Wash.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

JAMES F. BELL, chairman of the Board of General Mills, Inc., said the other day in Minneapolis: "Liberate enterprise and we shall soon create the new wealth necessary to bring us out of the depression. We are not going to make any real progress toward recovery until this is done."

A NUMBER of friends of the movement have departed since the January-February issue of LAND AND FREEDOM appeared, among them Thomas Ryan of Brooklyn. Mr. Ryan was over seventy and was a friend of Henry George. He had been ill for a long time.

CORNELIUS LEENHOUTS, of Milwaukee, Wis, is another friend to have passed away. For a long time he was secretary of the Wisconsin Single Tax League. In a communication to the Milwaukee *Sentinel* Herman Reel pays Mr. Leenhouts a deserved tribute. He had been a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM almost from the beginning.

FROM the *Christian Century* we learn of the death of J. H. Whitley, chairman of the British Radio Broadcasting Company, on Feb. 3 at the age of 68. He was formerly Speaker of the House of Commons

and a follower of Henry George. When he ceased to be Speaker he declined the peerage, which is always offered to ex-Speakers, and in 1930 he accepted the chairmanship of the Governors of the British Broadcasting Company. He was head of the commission that prepared a monumental report of the condition of labor in India.

JAMES MALCOLM, of Albany, familiarly known as "Jim" Malcolm, editor since 1917, of the *Red Book* and a devoted Henry George man, died at his home in Albany on Jan. 30 at the age of 75 of a sudden heart attack. He was editor of the *National Single Taxer* at Minneapolis for a period. He was a native of Edinburgh and came to the United States when a young man. It is a coincidence that on the very day of his death the *Red Book*, published by J. B. Lyon Company of Albany, was issued with a number of articles from the pen of Mr. Malcolm. The *Red Book* is a legislative encyclopedia and a valuable book of reference. For a number of years he was a friend and correspondent of LAND AND FREEDOM. His son Harvey Malcolm has inherited his father's convictions and is a frequent visitor to this office. Our sympathy is extended to him and other members of the family. Mr. Malcolm leaves also two daughters.

ABOUT two years ago a young man living near Arden attended a lecture given there by our friend Chas. H. Ingersoll. He believed in a vague way that socialism offered a remedy for conditions, but Mr. Ingersoll's answers to questions following his address aroused his interest, and further study made him an enthusiastic Single Taxer. Young Mr. Megginson is a musician and has had little opportunity for education, but several admirable letters have appeared from his pen in the Wilmington papers. Mrs. Ross of Arden sends us the clippings containing Mr. Megginson's letters and comments on the encouraging nature of such incidents as these. We may say that the Henry George School furnishes many similar examples.

A SINGLE TAX letter appears in the *Swedish Tribune News* of Chicago from the pen of our indefatigable friend Frank G. Anderson of James-town, N. Y. This journal is the most widely read Swedish newspaper in the United States and Canada, and is largely circulated in Sweden.

OUR old friend George White of Long Branch celebrated his eightieth birthday in February and the *Monmouth American* said: "For 46 years Mr. White has been a close student of political economy and has brought his ideas to the public in letters to the papers and correspondence with nationally known figures."

A LETTER received from Edward P. E. Troy of San Francisco, says: "If our militant Single Taxers would only look about them they would find that while quibbling and splitting hairs, the enemy is making headway against them through schools and colleges. A few weeks ago I spent some weeks in Salt Lake City and visited the Normal School opposite the Mormon Temple. I was informed that Ely's book on Economics was the only book used in the economics class. I found the same condition existing in schools and universities in other states I visited. There is great opportunity for our militant Single Taxers. They might get out hundreds of circulars containing extracts from Emil Jorgensen's book in which Prof. Ely is so mercilessly exposed."

ROSS C. HOLLEY of Lockport, N. Y., has recently written well considered letters to President Roosevelt and Father Coughlin. It may be in the oceans of letters sent by Henry George men to the President and the radio priest some will be read, but we are not hopeful. However, one can never tell and we would not discourage this wide-spread habit. Mr. Holley is a good friend of Mr. C. A. Lingham of Lockport and a recent convert to the cause.

JOHN C. ROSE and George E. Evans, the latter president of the Henry

George Foundation, have started a branch in Pittsburgh of the Henry George School with eighteen active students. In addition to these activities there has been organized the Rose Bureau of Research, the object of which will be to collect statistics and data relative to economic matters. The Rose Bureau is an idea of the late Francis W. Maguire. We are particularly shy on statistics and we welcome this activity. Mr. Rose in addition to all this work keeps up his ten letters a day minimum and is besides engaged in writing two books, one a Dictionary of Terms in the Social and Economic Sciences and "The Philosophy of William N. McNair, a Psychological Study of an Honest Politician."

CLASSES of the Henry George School have been started in Philadelphia. These classes will be under the instruction of Julian P. Hickok.

A CLUMSY connotation by the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM on page 31 of the January-February issue of LAND AND FREEDOM might convey the impression that our old friend Pavlos Giannelia, Greek representative at Vienna, had passed on. We are glad to report that we had no intention to hurry Mr. Giannelia away. He is still active in the movement and in perfectly good health.

W. A. RULE of Chicago, one of the bright outstanding lights of the Henry George Congress last autumn, reports that 1,900 copies of Otto Cullman's book "Twenty Million Dollars Every Day" have been distributed and 3,800 letters have gone forth from the Committee of Business Men on National Recovery. Representatives from the committee have addressed 36 meetings with well over 150 average attendance. It has been arranged to place Mr. Cullman's book in the hands of every member of Congress. This has been carried out through four or five interested members of that body.

J. OWEN GRUNDY of Jersey City advocates a "round robin" appeal to Governor Hoffman of New Jersey for a land value tax. He thinks that the population of the State is very evenly divided against the proposed sales tax and income tax advocated by the Governor and this furnishes an exceptional opportunity to promote the stock of the Single Tax. He suggests that the land value tax advocates should call upon the Governor with some definite proposals in lieu of what he recommends.

CHARLES S. PRIZER, active in the affairs of the Manhattan Single Tax Club of this city, writes: "I have just read your Comment and Reflection in the latest issue of LAND AND FREEDOM and wish to express my praise and appreciation of those keen, able and interesting comments on current economic events and problems."

M. J. VAN LEEUWEN of Franklin, Mass., writes us in appreciation of the article in January-February issue by Henry J. Foley, as follows:

In the form of questions and answers, the reader's interest is carried step by step and the subject is presented in a way which makes it easy to grasp and readily understand.

It is the kind of literature in which the truth is brought out in an A, B, C, sort of a way which opens the minds and creates a desire to learn more of what might have heretofore seemed too complex a question for the ordinary minds to cope with.

Therefore more power to Foley and his pen. This article should be put in pamphlet form and freely distributed.

THE "Economics of Henry George" is a well written pamphlet of 16 pages and cover by John C. Rose, of 725 Bakewell Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., sold for ten cents.

DR. W. E. MACKLIN recently celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his first mission and hospital opening in China.

INDIANAPOLIS wants more land for gardens. Over 1,300 persons have applied to the Community Garden Center for garden plots. Seeds will be distributed from the office beginning this month. Over \$100 worth of food stuffs was raised on a single garden plot last year.

"UNEMPLOYMENT and Business Depression and the Remedy," by David Gibson, is a 24-page pamphlet. It is published at fifteen cents and those who know Dave Gibson know it is worth it.

P. W. SCHWANDER, tells us in the *Dallas News* of Feb. 23, that Texas has 301,660 tenant farms throughout the State, though Teaxs is a new country with a territory larger than the German Empire. A letter from Mr. Schwander appears in a recent issue of *Liberty*.

THE New Hampshire Senate has approved a bill to allow new buildings a five-year period of tax exemption.

HENRY WARE ALLEN of Wichita, Kansas, writes:

"Wise old King Canute undertook before his courtiers to combat the force of natural law, but his experiment met with dire defeat, as he knew it would. Not so wise these modern sages. By imperial edict they essay to fix wages, hours of labor, prices, the crops of the field, even prosperity itself! They would reconstruct the universe on the basis of State Socialism, ignoring completely that supreme natural law which provides public revenue from ground rents and makes unnecessary the imposition of those multitudinous taxes which now crush all business enterprise and rob the citizen of his rightful property."

MR. A. E. DIETRICH, of Bay Shore, L. I., has addressed a letter to Congressman Bacon of New York in which he pertinently says: "Those who do not seek to increase the equality of opportunities for the citizens, and leave to them the results, but look rather to income and inheritance taxes as expedients while we are in the transition stage, have, it seems to me, the wrong perspective."

MR. M. VANVEEN addressed the Greenwich Historical Society on Feb. 12, his subject being "The Way to Abolish Unemployment and Poverty."

FRANK BERMAN, a Henry George man of this city, who is too seldom heard from, appears with an admirable letter in the *New York Herald-Tribune* of recent date.

HAROLD SUDELL of Brookline, Pa., is one of our most indefatigable letter writers. In a communication to Governor Earle of Pennsylvania he points out the effects of taxes interfering with production as distinct from taxes that fall upon the value of natural resources.

DR. FREDERICK W. ROMAN of the Associated Forums of California sent for two hundred copies of January-February LAND AND FREEDOM. He writes: "For next week I have asked some of my groups to make a special study of the educational philosophy on page 3 (Comment and Reflection). Also I am asking that they make a special study of the doctrine of Secretary Ickes on page 5 and then again I am inviting a special forum to consider the article beginning on page 9 and ending on page 14, (Henry J. Foley's article).

AGNES DE MILLE, daughter of Anna George de Mille, appeared in a dance recital at the Guild Theatre in this city in February, before an appreciative audience.

DONALD MACDONALD of Anchorage, Alaska, has issued a large page circular on Alaskan minerals and farm lands in which he advocates

the remedy for conditions. He says: "Very little money or organization would be required to put this over. The Alaskan problem is simple and obvious."

HERE is light from an unexpected source: Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt found that only in rare cases do persons refuse jobs because they are on the relief rolls. On the other hand she says that she found instances where communities had taken advantage of the fact that people were on the relief rolls to lower the wage rates.

A Single Tax enclave organized by Fiske Warren is situated in the republic of Andorra. In a circular just issued he tells us that Andorra has no customs tariff, that in one thousand years not one life has been lost in battle, that there is no public debt, no depression and no unemployment. This oldest and smallest Republic in the world is beautifully situated and an ideal place to make a small demonstration of the Henry George philosophy.

HERE is a joke said to be current in Soviet Russia: "Mother, the tax collector is here." "All right, darling; give the comrade a chair." "But, Mother, he wants all the furniture."

"THE Great Economic Delusion, an Answer to the Townsend Pension Plan," by Don L. Thompson, is a crushing expose of this stupendous fallacy. Mr. Thompson's address is E. 2527 Illinois Avenue, Spokane, Wash.

*Real America* is a large illustrated magazine published at Mount Morris, Ill. The April number is before us. In it is an article on "The Memphis Machine" in which occurs this mention of a friend of the movement whom we all love:

"One young assistant city attorney, A. D. Waldauer, frequently remained in his office all day and far into the night to discuss with anybody the matter of taxes.

"If a citizen kicked, said the taxes were outrageous, Waldauer didn't argue with him. He told him that it was not the taxes that were outrageous, but the whole tax system. Then he handed him a tract on the Single Tax, and offered to lecture on the subject! That always ended the discussion. You can't argue with a man who agrees with you."

"A SOCIAL Democratic Manifesto" is a pamphlet consisting of eight pages from the pen of Howell Clopton Harris of Cordele, Ga., which is well worth studious perusal. Mr. Harris will send a copy to any one asking for it.

"FORCE Into Use the Land Held to Ransom," is the title of an article by J. W. Graham Peace in the London *Daily Herald* of March 6, written with the vigor and persuasiveness that characterize everything he writes. The *Daily Herald* has a circulation of 2,300,000.

A RATHER unusual pamphlet in the form of an open letter to President Roosevelt by S. W. Simpson, 1165 Broadway, has reached us. We should disagree with some parts of it, but it is effectively written, and the author is an old member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club and an earnest advocate of the Georgan philosophy.

A CLASS of the Henry George School was established in Newark, N. J., on March 1 with thirty members including eight or ten lawyers. It will be under the leadership of Dr. Bowen who will use the Teachers' Manual of the Henry George School. The place of gathering is 17 Academy Street, Newark, N. J. Meetings are held weekly. Opportunity for discussion is afforded and a lively interest is manifested. "Progress and Poverty" is the text book. There is no expense incurred save one dollar for the purchase of the text book.

THINGS are happening at Fort Lee, N. J. The Fort Lee Club will

back the Single Tax as a means of attracting new buildings and homes. The *Bergen Record* gave a column report of the Eastern Bergen Italian-American Club's recent meeting to endorse the plan for the taxation of land values and exemption of improvements. Mr. Richard C. Pagliuchi is a leader of the club who announced that he had been a Single Taxer for twenty years. He made an argument for the application of the principle

*Grundskild*, Henry George organ of Denmark, published at Copenhagen, gives a translation of the article by Charles O'Connor Hennessy from LAND AND FREEDOM which bore the title of "Henry George and Henry Ford."

STEPHEN BELL, foreign editor of *Commerce and Finance*, a Wall Street organ of the cotton trade, delivered an address in Patterson, N. J. before one hundred bankers of Passaic County, N. J. recently. Mr. Bell is a teacher at the New York Henry George School and a lifelong disciple of our cause. The *Paterson Call* gave a full-page report of Mr. Bell's great address.

ROBERT O. NILSON of Teaneck, N. J., has addressed a letter to Governor Hoffman of that State advocating an emergency land value tax in lieu of the sales and income tax which the Governor recommends. He closes his letter by stating: "I would consider it a great pleasure to discuss this plan with you or one of your representatives at any time and place you may designate." Mr. Nilson has sent copies of his letter and his admirably sustained argument to the press and members of the legislature.

THE second edition of the pamphlet "The Mayor McNair Five-to-One Plan," which is dedicated to the memory of the beloved Francis Maguire, is available at ten cents a copy, and may be had by writing to John C. Rose, 725 Bakewell Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THERE is no Single Tax paper that comes to our desk that is more welcome than *Tax Facts*, edited by Miss Norma Cooley, at 333 North Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Miss Cooley has an unusual gift of writing clearly and attractively. She is a mistress of the art of incisive phrasing with surprising little turns that make one stop and listen. We know of no one writing today who is anywhere in her class

We learn with deep regret of the death of our old friend John Emery McLean, author of "Spiritual Economics," former editor of the *Arena*, *Mind* and *The Metaphysical Magazine*, and life long disciple of Henry George whose teachings he had done so much to popularize. We were in intimate touch with Mr. McLean when he was editor of the *Arena* and contributed a number of articles to that periodical. Mr. McLean died at Fairhope where he had his home. He was born in Ontario, Canada, in 1865 and was always interested in Canadian affairs. He is survived by his wife Caroline, a brother, Dr. W. T. McLean of St. Petersburg, Fla., and a step-daughter, Mrs. Rita S. Thompson, and a number of cousins in Canada and the United States.

WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, of Toronto, writes us: "I wish to take this opportunity to compliment you on the exceptionally well edited edition of your magazine for January-February. It is really a wonderful issue and it is a case of "he who runs may read."

ANOTHER death which it is our sorrow to record is that of Walter C. Kempton, for many years an active Single Taxer in San Francisco, who passed away March 6, 1935. Mr. Kempton was born in 1860 and had been a subscriber to this paper for many years. He was employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard until the breakdown of his health. He was a radical democrat and outspoken in his convictions. He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Walter C. Kempton.



## CHAINED

*A New Illustrated Brochure*

containing 30 halftone pictures and text matter, showing the increase of poverty with the increase of wealth.

Printed on a fine offset paper and sold to you at less than the printing cost. Buy as many as you can distribute to prospective students.

PHONE OR MAIL YOUR ORDERS TO

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**

211 W. 79TH STREET, NEW YORK

Telephone: SUsquehanna 7-1167

## WHY NOT MAKE A PRESENT

to the Library of your Alma Mater (High School or College) of the following books at the prices named:

**\$1.00** *Land and Liberty*, (one year)  
London, England

**\$2.00** LAND AND FREEDOM, (one year)  
with  
*Progress and Poverty* or *Social Problems*

**\$2.50** *The Philosophy of Henry George*  
By Prof. George Raymond Geiger

**\$10.00** to include the following:

*The Philosophy of Henry George*

LAND AND FREEDOM (one year) with  
*Progress and Poverty* or *Social Problems*,

*Land and Liberty* (one year)

*No Taxes*, (one year)

*Significant Paragraphs, Protection or Free Trade*

*The Great Robbery*, and the

*Life of Henry George*

**LAND AND FREEDOM**

150 Nassau Street

New York City

**WANTED** copies of *The Public* for June 11 and June 18, 1915. Will gladly pay \$1.00 each. These copies are needed to complete a set.

STANLEY BOWMAR, Burnside Drive, Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.

May—June, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

Wanted: One Thousand Teachers

Frank Chodorov

The Henry George School's Work

N. C. B. Fowles

A Message to the Extension Classes

Helen D. Denbigh

Work of the Schalkenbach Foundation

Antoinette Kaufmann

Book Reviews — Correspondence

News Notes and Personals

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress  
 Published by  
 SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York  
 JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island  
 JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor  
 HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 170 Broadway, New York City  
 CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City  
 GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

## MAY—JUNE, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 3 WHOLE No. 190

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.  
 GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.  
 AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.  
 NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.  
 SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.  
 DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.  
 BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.  
 MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,  
 Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	75
HOW VITAL IS THE SINGLENES OF THE SINGLE TAX? 77	
WANTED: ONE THOUSAND TEACHERS.. Frank Chodorov	79
ROBERT SCHALKENBACH REPORT...Antoinette Kaufmann	81
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.....	85
THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL.....N. C. B. Fowles	86
A MESSAGE TO EXTENSION CLASSES OF THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL.....Helen D. Denbigh	88
LEGISLATIVE ADVANCES.....	90
MISCELLANY.....	91
BOOK REVIEWS...Grace Isabel Colbron, J. D. M., B. W. B., C. H. K.....	94
CORRESPONDENCE.....	97
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	101

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

MAY—JUNE, 1935

No. 3

## Comment and Reflection

IT is astonishing how rapidly under certain provocative conditions men sink to a slave mentality. This attitude of mind so easily to cultivate is evidenced in the sympathy with which all sorts of pension schemes, public and private, are regarded. Why should any one be pensioned? Why should we expect newspapers, business firms, governments, to establish pension schemes for workers? If real wages have been paid there is no obligation on the part of employers, nor indeed of governments, to assume obligations of this kind to be discharged in the future. That such provisions are looked upon as matters of course and seem justified in the minds of the workers are evidences of a slave mentality.

A GREAT metropolitan newspaper has recently announced a modification of its pension system affecting those who have served it for a lengthy period. This pension allowance is to be paid only in the event of a year's illness preceding it. This move of the publishers is regarded with indignation and loud-voiced complaint, as if something were owed by the publishers to their employees. There are many similar instances which will occur to the reader. If all pensions, public and private, were abolished, we would be nearer an understanding of what should constitute the only compensation for service. The total sum set aside for the payment of pensions must be enormous.

THE government has set the example of course. Its first set-up in the payment of a public wage rate in excess of private wages and salaries has been an encouragement to this sort of thing. The private citizen, generally speaking, is paid less for the same service but is in most cases supposed to provide for illness and old age out of his current wages. The public servant, on the other hand, gets a higher rate of pay for the same service with a pension to boot when his limit of service is reached. It is an age of "gimme." And nobody appears to be ashamed of it. Its abridgement, as in the case of the metropolitan newspaper we have cited, is looked upon as an outrage.

THOSE who know what wages are, and who know that when they are paid the mutual obligation ex-

isting between employer and employed is finally and fairly discharged, will realize that the slave mentality which has been growing up out of our economic system, and as a consequence of it, will disappear among free men. No man owes anything to another save for actual service rendered, and pensions, public or private, are an unconscious confession of the injustice of the system under which we live.

IT is the age of the out-stretched palm—of a mendicant mentality. Those who in manlier times would have resented alms-giving eagerly demand it and are hurt if they do not receive it. Those great lines of Smollet which Burns said he would have given much to have written:

"Thy spirit, Independence, let me share,  
Lord of the lion heart and eagle eye,"

no longer appeal. Do we not sneer at "rugged individualism," conceiving in some strange way that rugged individualism means riding rough shod over the other fellow instead of that sturdy self-respect which, conscious of the rights of others regards no one as his master, and few as his superiors. It has taken years of man's divorcement from the land to destroy that and bring about the subtle change from the man of early America to the man he is today.

POVERTY does more than deprive man of actual comforts. If that were all it would not matter so much. But it destroys something more precious than animal needs. It eats into the mind and soul; it deadens self-respect; weakens independence of thought; saps intellectual integrity and courage. Man cannot long bend beneath an enforced dependence to a master, personal or impersonal, and expect to retain his manhood. He will soon come to talk the language of his masters, think their thoughts, feel as they feel. For man must live, and he seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion. To those who have the gift of employment, which is the gift of life or death, he must bow the knee. Is it any wonder that he soon comes to think the thought of his masters, talking as they talk, thinking as they think, hating as they hate, even worshiping as they worship, and finally dwarfing his immortal soul to the need of propitiating his masters by subordinating himself in word and deed to the tawdry pattern of their conven-

tionality. And finally the condition of a mendicant mentality fit only for a dictatorship, and the death of democracy!

**T**HERE can be no objection to any group of workers, labor unions or others, establishing old age pensions, life insurance, or pensions in cases of sickness or disability. That is something which concerns them alone. Our criticism is directed against that attitude of mind which looks to the employer as under any moral obligation to pay any kind of pension to the employees. This is purely a gratuity and should be so regarded. It tends to confuse the nature of wages and obscures the character of contract between employers and employed. How much of even voluntary insurance schemes would seem necessary or advisable when the community value of land is publicly absorbed and ready at hand to provide for emergencies, is a matter of conjecture.

**T**HAT will change everything. Pensions from this source would assume the character of public obligation. Employers owe nothing to their workers save their wages and fair treatment. The trouble is that economic conditions being what they are destroy all true perspective. The habit of regarding capital as the payer of wages, and the consequent subordination of labor to capital under present conditions, seems to justify these gratuities. They seem to justify government pensions, bonuses, benefactions out of private fortunes, and all the multitude of crazy notions that seem further to accentuate the unnatural dependence of the workers, who are really justified in demanding only one thing—freedom of access to the natural resources of the earth!

**T**ARIFFS conduce to the same habit of subserviency. But in a civilization such as ours it is idle to talk as Hoover does of "rugged individualism." Have the workers not been persuaded that they need protection? They have been taught for several generations that they are not able to take care of themselves, and it ill becomes a spokesman for the party of protection to talk of rugged individualism or individualism of any other kind.

**A**FTER several generations of "infant industries" Americans are still infants. It is impossible to imagine a more helpless population. Apparently we are at the mercy of every other people. Once it was England, then it was Germany, now it is Japan. We are subjected to the competition of these malevolent powers. We have faced the depression in the same spirit. Regarding it as a natural calamity, we have turned, not to our own resources, and our own resolution to overcome it, but to government.

**I**T is the same habit of our ancestors who prayed to the sun, against drought or for more abundant harvests.

And the belief that some miraculous powers were lodged in government is the outgrowth of this spirit of dependence. Man is impressed with the sense of his own helplessness. He is being destroyed by the systems, political and economic, which he has created.

**T**HERE was a time when Americans stood erect. Perhaps, almost certainly, this brave attitude of mind was an unconscious reflex of the knowledge that there were great frontiers which beckoned them, the easy access to this land and the right to work that was open to them. With the gradual closing of these frontiers, they were easy victims of a mendicant political economy in which they were taught that they must be helped by government. They still cherished the stupidity voiced in many Fourth of July orations of the "dignity of labor," about which they prated and to which conditions everywhere visible opposed a blank denial.

**J**APAN wants more room, which means more land. Hence the danger of war. We are told by Prof. Jesse Holmes of Swarthmore College that Japan is "terribly overcrowded, terribly poor." But who is crowding her? There is no question that any country, Japan included, with equality of land distribution, is able to support its existing population. Japan is in the position of being out-distanced in the business of land gambling—"a belated bandit," Prof. Holmes calls her. But if nobody were crowding her she would not be giving the impression of being overcrowded, and that is true of every country. Landowners are doing the crowding. Prof. Holmes calls all nations "bandits," which is a pretty accurate description, though he does not quite sense the reason for it all.

**T**HE curious misunderstanding about "overcrowded" nations is very persistent, despite the fact that it has no basis in fact or arithmetic. Even Frank H. Simonds, who has done some clear thinking on international questions, says that the way to avoid war would be for the nations rich in natural resources to divide up in order to live in peace in a normal world. He sees that it is hunger for land that causes war. He is not very clear about it. He does not see that what is the matter with "overcrowded nations" is that land owners are doing the crowding. If a nation has not enough of the things it needs it can share in the natural resources of the world by letting down the barriers to freedom of exchange.

**I**NTERNATIONAL wars and civil wars alike—most of them—have their basis in land or tariffs. They are shooting down peasants in Spain, of whom there are some three million, because the promise of agrarian reforms were not kept. The peasants who were shot down were called "anarchists"—a convenient term. Men who protest against conditions will always be called anarchists

or communists. What do their crazy theories matter? The only dreadful fact that is obvious enough is that men are hungry and that they will revolt and fight to satisfy their hunger. They are divorced from the land and that is the sole reason they are hungry. They have no place to work and land is a place to work.

LOOK where we will the conflict is the same. Paraguay is fighting to secure the petroleum fields of Bolivia. The Chaco war is a fight for land—oil fields are land. Not that it really matters to the native Paraguayan worker who owns the petroleum fields—he never will. And that is one of the mysteries of the matter explainable only by the unfathomable ignorance of man. Paraguayans and Bolivians hate each other, kill each other, over land they will never have any right to own. If they were going to get the land for themselves there would be some sense in it. But whoever owns the oil-fields, Paraguayans and Bolivians will work for the owners as miserable slaves, as they always did.

THE Ukraine is a great wheat country and produces more iron and coal than all of France. Germany has long cast envious eyes upon it. Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, hints at the seizure of the Ukraine. Germany would gladly go to war to secure it. Land again as the urge to war. Italian imperialism rushes more and definitely into Ethiopia where there are vast natural resources.

IT is always land or tariffs that are the cause of war. It is news that has not yet got into the news that West Australia is anxious to secede from the Australian Commonwealth because of the high tariff taxation of the Canberra Government. It is even hinted that West Australia with half a million people is willing to take up arms to enforce its demand if it should be refused. King George and the British Parliament have been petitioned for permission to secede. If the petition is not granted a peaceful withdrawal is to be put to a referendum of the people of West Australia. Either the tariff must be abolished or greatly lowered. In the *San Francisco News* its correspondent Sam Ewing has interviewed one of the leading business men of Perth, West Australia, who said: "I do not mean to predict in advance what the vote will be. But it is a matter of life and death with us. My state is agricultural. It sells products in the world market. The eastern Australian states have the power to enforce a high protective tariff for the protection of their infant industries. The tax is too much of a burden on our farming community." This presents a very interesting situation. And it can easily lead to civil war. Again let it be said, and it cannot be said too often, that the two causes of war—one a primary and the other a secondary cause—are the private ownership of natural resources and hostile tariffs.

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE at a meeting at Fraunces' Tavern in this city on April 17 is reported to have said: "Under the machine age there will be a certain economic wastage; we must take care of that wastage, not only in giving them food, shelter and clothing, but some part and parcel in our life." Who are the "we" referred to and the "our" whose duty it seems to be to take care of this human wastage, is left to conjecture. It sounds like a piece of impudence, but it is not really so; it is quite unconscious. And this is the utterance of one who is regarded as a "liberal" leader of the Republican party and shows how little we can hope from the accredited spokesmen of the G. O. P. But what do those who comprise this "human wastage" think of it? Mr. White is quite as confused and hopeless as the leaders of the party he is opposing. What becomes of the doctrine of rugged individualism if it is inevitable that any part of the population can be characterized as "human wastage?" Can it be that this includes the workers who produce the wealth of the world?

## How Vital is the Singleness of the Single Tax

REPLY TO WALTER FAIRCHILD  
By HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM

MUST an advocate of land-value taxation as the major source of local governmental revenues, if endowed with a rational mind, believe literally in the Single Tax as the sole desirable source of all governmental revenues, National, State and local? This question is suggested by Walter Fairchild's courteous and critical discussion, in the March-April issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, of my article, "If Henry George Were Writing Today," which had appeared in the February number of *The Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics*.

Mr. Fairchild assumes, apparently, the inerrancy of Henry George; and he argues, in effect, that a more careful reading of "Progress and Poverty" would result in my acceptance of the verbal inspiration of every statement therein and of his deductions therefrom.

From this assumption I must respectfully dissent. In repeated utterances, in print and over the radio, I am on record as recognizing the essential justice and desirability of the collection for public purposes of the community-created economic rent of land. But I do not believe it essential to the purity—or perhaps I should say productivity—of that method of taxation that it renounce all of its former fiscal associates and become a *single* tax. Here was what I said in the concluding paragraph of my radio talk of April 20, 1935, on "The Socialization of Ground Rent:"

"It is not the *single* tax that I am advocating, for my creed is that of a triple-taxer—not a Single-Taxer. I favor properly graded income and inheritance taxes for National

and State revenues, and am emphatically opposed to general sales taxes and other repressive levies. I do not believe that *all* community expenditures are reflected in increased land values; nor do I believe that *all* privilege and exploitation would be abolished by the socialization of ground rent. But I do believe that privilege for the few and prosperity for the many are mutually exclusive terms; and I want to see a demonstration in the United States of our ability to build a depression-proof civilization free from the evils both of fascism and of communism. To such a civilization I know of no economic readjustment which would give greater impetus than the abolition of that major form of privilege which would disappear with the socialization of ground rent."

With this expression of faith, it may now be in order to discuss two or three of the points raised in Mr. Fairchild's article, as indicating why I cannot go the whole distance with the 100 per cent followers of Henry George.

Simon-pure Single Taxers embrace fervently the *benefits-received* theory of taxation, and reject with disdain the *ability-to-pay* theory. But are they wholly consistent? Do they not ignore the fact that ability to pay has often resulted in large part from benefits—financial, physical or mental—previously received from society or by inheritance? and that for such benefits the recipient may deserve no more credit than for benefits derived from land ownership? There is, I believe, both ethical and economic justification for a system of taxation based *in part* on the principle that the strong or the clever or the lucky should bear the burden of the weak or the stupid or the luckless. In other words, ability to pay may properly be coordinated with benefits received in a scientific system of promoting the public welfare in the raising of public revenues.

To what extent is governmental spending reflected in ground rents? This is one of the most important questions raised by Mr. Fairchild. He expresses agreement with my contention that public expenditures must be *wisely* made in order to increase land values; but he goes so far as to state categorically that economic rent cannot be less than the total of all public budgets properly spent. Even if this last statement were susceptible of proof, it would still leave up in the air the tremendous sums that are unwisely or improperly spent—whether on wars or graft, or in planless building or well-intentioned blundering. Who can say that all such expenditures are reflected in ground rents or that they ought to be paid for wholly by land-value taxation? Or why should any one assume that if the Single Tax were the law of the land, waste and dishonesty and foolishness in public spending would disappear? Certainly not Mr. Fairchild or Henry George, for the former quotes the latter as ascribing no "magic" to the Single Tax and as expressly teaching that "it is not a panacea for all the economic ills of humanity."

Another important statement in my article in *The Journal of Land and Public Utility Economics* which Mr.

Fairchild challenges, is that "urban areas show more of their total valuation in improvements than do the rural areas." "We think the contrary is true," says Mr. Fairchild. "Figures on rural site values in relation to improvements," Mr. Fairchild points out, "are largely lacking." But such figures as exist do not appear to support his criticism of my contention. In November, 1934, the Tax Policy League published a bulletin on "Assessing Land and Improvements." The sources of data were the latest available reports of State tax officials—in most cases covering the year 1933 or 1932. From this study it appears that twenty-seven States published figures on land and improvement values. In sixteen of these States (Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin) separate figures are given for rural and urban areas. It was found that, without exception, improvements constituted a larger proportion of total real estate values in urban than in rural areas. The value of improvements in urban areas ranged from 44.2 to 70.5 per cent of total urban real estate.

Conversely, land values in urban areas ranged from 29.5 to 55.8 per cent of the total values. In rural areas improvements ranged from 9.5 to 38 per cent of the total, while in rural areas they ranged from 62 to 90.5 per cent of the total.

PROPORTION OF ASSESSED VALUATIONS  
FOR LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS

	URBAN		RURAL	
	Land	Improvements	Land	Improvements
Arizona	36.3%	63.7%	(Irrigated) 80.2%	19.8%
			(Dry) 84.9	15.1
California	55.8	44.2	75.7	24.3
Colorado	35.4	64.6	79.9	20.1
Idaho (Business)	40.3			
(Residence)	33.6	66.4	90.5	9.5
Illinois	47.6	52.4	82.4	17.6
Kansas	33.5	66.5	89.7	11.3
(Suburban)	38.7	61.3		
Louisiana	33.9	66.1	79.6	20.4
Minnesota	33.3	66.7	79.4	20.6
Montana	29.5	70.5	87.0	13.0
Ohio	35.7	64.5	62.0	38.0
Oklahoma	36.3	63.7	88.6	11.4
Oregon	54.0	46.0	88.3	11.7
South Dakota	31.6	68.4	90.3	9.7
Virginia	42.5	57.5	62.2	37.8
Washington	44.7	55.3	69.9	30.1
Wisconsin	33.1	66.9	69.5	30.5

Mr. Fairchild urges me to re-read "Book II of 'Progress and Poverty,' where the subject of increasing and decreasing population is worked out by Henry George." He says that I have failed to observe, as George did, that . . . "there may be an increase in land values even though population remains fixed or even recedes." May I reciprocate by urging Mr. Fairchild to re-read a sentence on page 421 of "Progress and Poverty:" "With

every increase of population the value of land rises; with every decrease it falls." This statement by Henry George does not prove that his other statement is unsound; but it does at least show—as might be shown by many other quotations—that the Prophet of San Francisco, like other great leaders, was not always and wholly consistent.

One need not insist on the verbal inspiration of "Progress and Poverty" to believe, as I do, that it is one of the noblest of books ever written. Nor need the Single Taxers fear that the fundamental thesis of their great leader will be weakened by constructive attempts to re-study and re-state it for the world of 1935.

## Wanted: One Thousand Teachers

SCHWARTZ, a Minneapolis lawyer, said to me after he had completed his first class in "Progress and Poverty:" "In ten weeks I made fifteen Single Taxers. That is more than I made in the twenty years I have been talking Single Tax." His second class, recruited mainly by "graduates," has an enrollment of twenty-five.

Other teachers of Extension Courses with whom I have come in contact report the same result. The teaching of "Progress and Poverty" according to the Teacher's Manual published by the Henry George School of Social Science is the most effective and quickest method of making converts to the Single Tax cause.

Let us consider the other tried methods of making Single Taxers. That these methods have been found wanting is manifest by the smallness of our numbers, by the public rejection of our point of view as indicated by increased taxes on labor products and reduced taxes on land values, by the definite and outspoken programmes of governments to further safeguard the privileges of landlords. These methods consist of two kinds: making speeches and distributing literature. The speeches are ineffective, as far as making converts is concerned, not because of lack of oratorical ability, but because such audiences as are available primarily seek entertainment. Serious education is very far from the minds of lunch clubs when they listen to a speaker; street corner crowds are notorious for their heckling proclivities; church groups class speakers with bridge tournaments as a diversion. I have tried talking economics to all kinds of audiences. After losing a few audiences I learned that the way to hold them was to tell stories, hoping that these stories might carry home some significant fact of economics. Because I entertained my audiences I held them. But, did I make Single Taxers?

It must be remembered that we are not only trying to uproot the greatest and most strongly entrenched vested interest of all times, but that in attempting to do this we must destroy ideas so deeply imbedded in the

minds of men, so bulwarked by law, so thoroughly accepted as right and necessary through centuries of practice and precedent, that the fragmentary character of a short speech is quite apt to create in the minds of the audience a doubt as to the sanity of a Single Tax speaker. When we speak of wealth as only the product of labor and land, and deny that land, bonds, mortgages and even money are wealth, we are asking people to believe something as foreign from their experience and thinking as that two and two are five. To tell a worker that a tax on land values will create jobs, where for a hundred years he has been convinced that only the wickedness of a "boss" prevents his going to work, is to request him to re-orientate his entire thinking processes; that cannot be done successfully in an hour's talk.

The only possible beneficial effect of a speech on Single Tax is to arouse curiosity in the minds of some of the more thoughtful in our audiences, hoping that such curiosity will result in their study of the subject. No doubt many who have read "Progress and Poverty" and have become followers of Henry George were first interested in the subject by some speaker. But that this result must of necessity be very spasmodic, uncertain and rare is quite evident.

The distribution of literature (which includes letter-writing to the Vox Populi columns of newspapers) would be valuable propaganda if the literature were always read. I venture to say, and my estimate is the result of my own experience and the opinions of others, that not one-tenth of the literature we Single Taxers have distributed was ever read. It is evident, also, that only the briefest and simplest pamphlets are read; so that the distribution of literature becomes, like speaking, a haphazard searching for a few thoughtful minds who will be stimulated to further investigation.

Both public speaking and the distribution of literature are of necessity uncertain in their effect and nebulous in results. If we could have a hundred speakers making daily talks all over the country, and could unload ten million pamphlets on the public in a year, it is quite likely that a sufficiently large number of susceptible minds could be reached, so that in a comparatively short time our numbers would be considerably augmented. Obviously, this is a physical and financial impossibility.

The object of a speaking or literature campaign is to interest people in a study of our philosophy. More specifically, we would like to have a wider knowledge and understanding of "Progress and Poverty." Now, the class method is much more direct, concise, certain, and the results are immediately known. Take a group of fifteen students through the book in ten weekly lessons and you are almost sure of fifteen Single Taxers. I do now wish to depreciate the value of Single Tax talks, or of distributing literature. I rather think these talks and the literature should be used as a means of advertising classes. Experience has shown that as between the

teaching and the propaganda methods, the former is much more satisfactory. Certainly, it is much less nebulous in results.

Some Single Taxers have objected to the teaching method as too slow. They advocate political action. No one denies that eventually the Single Tax must enter the arena of politics. We advocate a change in our fiscal law, and surely such a change must be brought about by a counting of ballots. I am a firm believer in political action, not only because that is an eventual necessity, but because there is no better form of propaganda. But there are not enough Single Taxers in the country, or in any one State or city, to warrant undertaking the job. In the City of New York, where there are more Single Taxers than elsewhere in the country, I do not believe there are more than a thousand people who understand our philosophy and believe in it thoroughly enough to undertake a political campaign. And, more important, political action entails very much more expense than our meagre numbers could sustain. Even if a successful campaign could be conducted, so that by some fortunate circumstance we should be able to write the Single Tax into the statutes of any one State, let us say, the results might be quite disastrous; for, unless there is a very considerable number of citizens who understand what we aim to do, the landlords could so twist our plans out of shape as to discredit the Single Tax in the minds of the electorate, and make it so dismal a "failure" as to delay this great reform for many more years, perhaps centuries. I do not mean that we must be an actual majority to inaugurate and maintain Single Tax laws, but surely we must be a much larger minority than we are now.

If every Single Taxer in the country will do his or her part in furthering the educational campaign of the Henry George School of Social Science, within at most ten years we shall have a sufficiently large body of Single Taxers to make possible successful political campaigns. Fifty-six years have elapsed since "Progress and Poverty" was given to the world. None of us is proud of the progress we have made. Ten years is a short time to devote to a plan which, judging by our experience with it during the past two years, gives so much promise of definite, certain results.

The aim is to start one thousand classes in "Progress and Poverty." Let us take an average of ten students to a class. The course is completed in ten weeks, which makes it possible to repeat the course four times in one year. Each teacher will have "graduated" forty in a year—and a thousand times forty is a large number. If this is continued for ten years, is my prediction of a sufficiently large minority to make its voice heard too sanguine? It must be remembered that every "graduate" is a potential teacher of a class, or a propagandist, or a possible leader. What the result of such an educational campaign can be must be left to one's imagination. It

is quite evident that the teaching campaign has possibilities of developing so progressively as to make our fondest hopes seem conservative.

All this campaign requires is *your* willingness to do something to further the cause you so ardently believe in. It entails no expense, except one dollar for a copy of the Teacher's Manual. Each student supplies himself with a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and even if you can afford to furnish these books it is better to require the students to purchase them; they then have an investment in the course and for that reason are more likely to attend regularly and to prepare their lessons.

You can teach "Progress and Poverty." Even if you lack confidence in your own pedagogical ability, remember that you have Henry George to help you. Your object is not to sell yourself, but to encourage your students to read the great book. With the Teacher's Manual to guide you there is really no teaching problem at all. And, of course, after you have completed one class, the teaching of the ensuing classes will become simpler and more interesting.

Your only problem is the recruiting of students for your first class. In several cases ministers have been helpful in this by advertising the course among their parishioners, in their Men's Clubs, etc. I know of one class that was started by the Single Taxer's daughter; she and her "boy friend" enlisted their friends. One man told his stenographer that he was going to have a class, and she did the rest. Another man who runs a large plant organized a class among his employees. A public official, who is a Single Taxer, induced the men in his office to join. It is in the organizing of your first class that you must exercise ingenuity. The second class organizes itself.

Where to hold the class? In your office, your living room, the basement of your church, in a public building. That should present no problem.

Be one of The Ten Thousand Teachers. Start now. One night a week devoted to this great work will not be a sacrifice. It will be a pleasure and an inspiration. You will enjoy the work, for what greater enjoyment can a Single Taxer have than teaching the great truth he so fervently believes?

I told an old-time Single Taxer about this work. He is a man in the seventies. "Yes," he said, "We have to do this thing. Our death rate is greater than our birth rate." That remark is a worthy text for a Single Tax sermon. Unless you and I and all Single Taxers get busy right now teaching the gospel of freedom as preached by our great prophet, where will the Single Taxers of the next generation come from?—FRANK CHODOROV.

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

There are some statements in this article with which we must disagree. One is Mr. Chodorov's contention that the number of our believers is decreasing. We believe on the contrary that our doc-

trines are penetrating, if slowly, the minds of increasing numbers. And we are in a position to know.

We are prone to look back to the old Anti-Poverty days and to the wonderful campaign of 1886 when a vote of 68,000 was counted for Henry George in what is now the Borough of Manhattan. But there were few believers in those years. Men followed Henry George as an almost inspired leader. But as far as any knowledge of his philosophy was concerned it is doubtful if more than a few hundred really comprehended it.

Let us recall to Mr. Chodorov a matter of history. From the platform of the Anti-Poverty Society we heard one speaker declare that he always broke the ginger ale bottles in order to provide work for the bottle-makers! We heard another ask in the event of prohibition what all those at work in breweries and elsewhere would do when they were thrown out of employment. It never seems to have occurred to him that the liquor addicts might spend their money for candy. Now remember that these speakers appeared on a Henry George platform and were accredited spokesmen of the Anti-Poverty Society!

We say confidently that this could not happen today in any gathering of men calling themselves Georgists.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

## He Was My Friend

EARLY in the World War I wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Sun regarding a tariff article it had published in which I pointed out the absurdity of choking trade in order to encourage industry, since industry and trade were not separate things, but merely separable parts of the same thing, the supplying of human needs and wants. Great was my surprise to get a letter from Theodore H. Price, the "Cotton King," who had been but a name to me, with a clipping of my letter to the editor enclosed, asking me to amplify my views for *Commerce and Finance*. I did so, got a very satisfactory check in return, and an invitation to join him at luncheon at some convenient time, which I soon did. Soon after we entered the war I was persuaded to join him.

How he so long put up with my propensity to "preach" has often puzzled me, though I know that in his heart he sympathized with it to a degree. "Bell," he said to me many years ago, "I thoroughly agree with you that the Georgian economic philosophy is ideal. It affords the only ethically sound and equitable basis for a real civilization, and eventually the world must come to it if civilization is to endure. But I see obstacles in the way of its adoption which you know not of and cannot now realize, and at my time of life I do not feel equal to undertaking a crusade for it."

On another occasion, in objecting to publishing something I had written, he suddenly asked me if my father were a preacher, and on my admitting that both my grandfather and great-grandfather had been clergymen, he exclaimed:

"I knew it! You're a born preacher—it's in your blood!"

Nevertheless, with all the many-sidedness of his genius, sometimes contradictory, he was one of Nature's princes, and my grief at his passing is tempered with a sense of exaltation and thankfulness that I was privileged to know him and can say: "He was my friend."

STEPHEN BELL in *Commerce and Finance*.

NOAH WEBSTER wrote in 1787: "The present generation have no right to say what the next generation shall deem a privilege . . . If our posterity are bound by our constitutions, and can neither alter nor amend them, they are to all intents and purposes slaves."—*An Answer to the Dissenting Members of the Pennsylvania Convention*.

## Robert Schalkenbach Report

### INTERESTING PUBLICITY

AMONG the interesting clippings that have been sent to us by our News Bureau, should be mentioned a series by Mr. Leslie Eichel of the Central Press Association. Several years ago Mr. Eichel visited the Foundation Office in search of information and material on the gold question, and he asked whether Henry George had written anything on this subject. The late Arthur Pleydell, who happened to be in the office at the time, looked up several references in George's writings for Mr. Eichel. Later Mr. Eichel quoted in syndicated articles from these references. He received material from this office from time to time, including the book, "Social Problems," and our prepared review which mentions Public Debt. Recently we were glad to note a series of four articles written by Mr. Eichel for the Central Press Association, widely syndicated in newspapers throughout the middle west, and east. In the first article, Mr. Eichel says:

#### "PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Some students of economics are going back to a book written fifty-years ago to find a way out of present difficulties.

The book is "Social Problems," by the same Henry George who wrote the classic "Progress and Poverty" (which some of our readers would have us re-read).

Henry George bulks larger and larger as the years pass. He may go down into history as the major American prophet—and his words of more than half a century ago still may lead to a new social order.

Among the most striking words in Henry George's "Social Problems" are these (and they might have been written this very hour):

"Upon the assumption that ascendants may bind descendants, that one generation may legislate for another generation, rests the assumed validity of our land titles and public debts.

"If it were possible for the present to borrow of the future, for those now living to draw upon wealth to be created by those who are yet to come, there could be no more dangerous power, none more certain to be abused; and none that would involve in its exercise a more flagrant contempt for the natural and inalienable rights of man.

"But we have no such power, and there is no possible invention by which we can obtain it. When we talk about calling upon future generations to bear their part of the costs and burdens of the present, about imposing upon them a share in expenditures, we take the liberty of assuming they will consider such expenditures to have been made for their benefit as well as for ours—which is an absurdity."

Henry George strikes directly at the present situation with:

"Public debts are not a device for borrowing from the future, for compelling those yet to be, to bear a share in the expenses which a present generation may choose to incur. That is, of course, a physical impossibility. They are merely a device for obtaining control of wealth in the present by promising that a certain distribution of wealth in the future shall be made—a device by which the owners of existing wealth are induced to give it up under promise, not merely that other people shall be taxed to pay them, but that other people's children shall be taxed for the benefit of their children or the children of their assigns."

and he continues to quote at considerable length from George.

The second article reads in part as follows:

### "WAR PROFITEERING"

"Share-the-Wealth" ideas are not new. They were more soundly stated in the past.

Yesterday we quoted Henry George on debt burdens. When the noted Single Tax philosopher-economist was writing he was speaking of conditions following the Civil War.

Conditions are not much different now, except that the United States has used up all its primeval expanses and now must "come-back" purely on a sound economic basis, if it is to have a "come-back."

Henry George wrote on sharing income not so fantastically, but much more basically than leaders in such movements today.

We shall quote words of his written fifty-two years ago in his book, "Social Problems"—words that stand out as if they were written this very hour.

Said Henry George, fifty-two years ago.

"The wealth expended in carrying on the war (the American Civil War) did not come from abroad or from the future, but from the existing wealth in the States under the National flag. If, when we called on men to die for their country, we had not shrunk from taking, if necessary, nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars from every millionaire, we need not have created any debt.

"But instead of that, what taxation we did impose was so levied as to fall on the poor more heavily than on the rich, and to incidentally establish monopolies by which the rich could profit at the expense of the poor."

Likewise this article runs on with long quotations and interesting observations.

The third article really should be quoted in full, but space does not permit, and we reproduce here just a few paragraphs to show the tenor of Mr. Eichel's remarks.

### "YESTERDAY'S PROBLEMS THE SAME TODAY"

Henry George, American philosopher-economist, author of "Progress and Poverty," in writing fifty-two years ago of problems of post-Civil war period, seems to have been writing of present day problems.

In "Social Problems," a less widely quoted volume than "Progress and Poverty," Henry George wrote these words, which seem to be of the latest first page news:

"Nor do the public misfortune and corruptions of government which arise from the ignorance and contempt of human rights involved in the recognition of public debts, end with the cost of war and war-like preparation, and the corruptions which such vast public expenditures foster."

Another present-day problem was attacked fifty-two years ago by Henry George with these deductions:

"Indirect taxation, the other device by which the people are bled without feeling it, and with which those who could make the most effective resistance to extravagance and corruptions are bribed into acquiescence, is an invention whereby taxes are levied that those who directly pay are enabled to collect again from others, and generally do collect with a profit, in higher prices.

"Those who directly pay the taxes and, still more important, those who desire high prices, are thus interested in the imposition and maintenance of taxation, while those on whom the burden ultimately falls do not realize it.

"The most corrupting extravagances in every department of administration has thus been fostered, and every endeavor used to increase expense.

"We have deliberately substituted a costly currency for a cheap currency.

"We have deliberately added to the cost of paying off the public debt.

"We are digging silver out of certain holes in the ground in Nevada and Colorado and hiding it in other holes in the ground in Washington, New York and San Francisco, where it is not a whit more useful.

"We are spending great sums in needless 'public improvements,' and we are paying pensions under a law which seems framed but to put a premium upon fraud. . . .

"Any proposition to reduce taxation arouses the most bitter opposition from those who profit, or who imagine they profit, from the imposition of this taxation."

Of course, Henry George had a remedy. We may quote from it. It too, will sound very much up to the minute.

In the fourth and last article of the series, Mr. Eichel writes as follows:

### "THE NRA AND MONOPOLIES"

The weakness of the NRA lies in its creation and protection of monopolies. Its strength lies in certain elements of it, that shorten the hours of labor and bar child labor.

Critics of NRA, however, assert that the monopolistic features are too dangerous to be assuaged by the benefits of the other features.

Critics of monopolies, and other problems of the day, are referring to Henry George, noted American economic writer of more than half a century ago.

And the writer of this column has been making a re-analysis of the Henry George works. They seem to touch the problems of today as clear-sightedly as the problems of the post-Civil War period.

Henry George wrote this on monopoly in "Social Problems," fifty-two years ago:

"I am not denouncing the rich, nor seeking, by speaking of these things, to excite envy and hatred. But if we could get a clear understanding of social problems, we must recognize the fact that it is due to monopolies which we permit and create, to advantages which we give one man over another, to methods of extortion sanctioned by law and public opinion, that some men are enabled to get so enormously rich while others remain so miserably poor."

Henry George had a solution, which in this day is not considered by persons "on the left" as sufficient of a solution. This is the nub of the Henry George solution:

"To abolish all taxation except that upon land values."

Said Henry George:

"In every civilized country, even the newest, the value of the land taken as a whole is sufficient to bear the entire expenses of government."

And if you desire to know why Henry George believed that would give every man a fair share of earnings, you are earnestly requested to read "Progress and Poverty."

We thank the reader who suggested that we re-read it.

In making acknowledgement to Mr. Eichel for this unusual series, we learned from him that the demand and response was so favorable that he wrote a fifth article explaining George's position on the land question and the taxation of land values. We cite these fruits of a gift of "Social Problems" to a member of the writing profession because they show what has been done not only in this case but in many others. The Foundation has supplied timely material to a long list of friendly editors and staff writers over a period of about five or six years.

A copy of "Social Problems" was given to Mr. John Chamberlain of the *New York Times* book review section in 1934. Previous to that he, of course, received copies of "Progress and Poverty." On April 10, 1935, in reviewing a book entitled, "The Chart of Plenty," Mr. Chamberlain wrote as follows:

### "GO BACK TO HENRY GEORGE"

But too much can be claimed for books like "The Chart of Plenty."



As Murray Godwin once pointed out, there has always been enough in the world for every one. What has always kept most people from getting a good living is monopolization by an elite of land and natural resources, as Henry George long ago explained. "Progress and Poverty" is still a far more important book than "The Chart of Plenty."

Mr. Andrew P. Canning, in visiting the editor of the *Arizona Daily Star*, has interested him in Henry George's solution for depressions, and much space has been given in the Arizona paper as a result. Furthermore, when the editor came East, he started interesting his friends in several large corporations who promptly got in touch with the Foundation for copies of George's books.

Readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will be glad to know that an exhibit of Henry George's books has been arranged in the Palace of Photography at the San Diego Fair, June to November of this year. A placard was designed, stating briefly who Henry George was, the fact that his books are read by millions, and urging those who visit the booth to get in touch with the Foundation for further information. Several other publishers, chief among whom are Macmillan, Doubleday, and Farrar & Rinehart, are represented in this booth. All those who live in San Diego, as well as the fortunate Single Taxers who may visit the Exposition, will have the opportunity to visit this book corner which is under the auspices of the Beacon Book Shop, Mr. Placht, (New York headquarters, Roosevelt Hotel).

Quite the most important publicity from the point of view of space and attention value, is the remarkable interview and visit which Mrs. Roosevelt made to Arden, Del. Pictures of Arden showing Mrs. Roosevelt, Frank Stephens, and others, made the first page of practically all the large newspapers, and the column matter was concerned with information about Arden, the subsistence homestead possibilities, and Arden's Single Tax methods of raising revenue.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Fiske Warren, an advertisement was placed in the *Motion Pictures of the World* magazine, entitled, "Andorra The Hidden Republic, No Customs Tariff, No Life Lost in Battle for 1,000 Years, No Public Debt, No Unemployment, No Depression, Andorra Exemplifies the Teachings of Henry George." In the lower left corner Mr. Warren inserted an advertisement for "Progress and Poverty;" in the center a special offer of one copy of his book, "Enclaves of Economic Rent," free to each purchaser of "Progress and Poverty" who sends in to the Foundation for the book; in the right hand corner, a reference to the Henry George School. In addition to placing the advertisement in the magazine, Mr. Warren supplied upwards of 3,000 "tear-sheets" which we sent out to a number of people on our list as a matter of information.

## HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL

### DEVELOPMENT OF EXTENSION CLASSES

In addition to the contacts reported in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, with leaders who were organizing Extension Classes of the Henry George School, we report the following:

Mr. Darwin Smith, president of California College of Commerce, has experienced such a large response to his plan for classes in "Progress and Poverty" that he reports the enrollment of about forty-five students. He said: "I had no idea there would be so many new people who would want books."

Mr. Schwartz, in reporting the conclusion of his classes in Minneapolis, tells us that he is going to have a banquet and commencement evening, and that out of his class he expects to prepare three or four teachers who will open classes of their own. He asks us to send free literature to his lists of names, and this we are doing, but we would like to make an appeal here to any of our Single Tax friends who may be in a position to help, for funds to continue this kind of distribution. Our resources are just large enough to print the books and carry the overhead of maintaining their distribution together with the other services that the Foundation is offering. Supplying free literature is expensive because of printing and postage involved. If, however, we had a fund of \$100 or \$200 it would help us to maintain a separate distribution for just such purposes as the sending out of pamphlet literature to graduating classes.

Mr. Lincoln Crowell informed us that he has spoken to four economics classes in high schools in Sandwich, Mass., and to four adult groups, and that he has brought to conclusion his own class of thirteen.

It will be remembered that we reported on a gift of books to the First Unitarian Church, Los Angeles, following their series of lectures on Henry George and the Single Tax, under the auspices of their minister, the Rev. Ernest Caldecott. After correspondence with Rev. Caldecott and others, an Extension Class was formed and upwards of forty pupils have enrolled for a course in the church. We have received a friendly letter from Mr. Woodhead who is in touch with the group, and he says that Mrs. de Mille attended the first meeting, giving it a splendid start. He states that Mr. George Lee is conducting a class of thirty students in Pasadena.

Mr. Noah D. Alper of St. Louis, has been conducting Henry George groups and sending out questionnaires to business men in an endeavor to arouse interest in the further study of "Progress and Poverty." From a recent visit by Jackson Ralston, we learn that henceforth Mr. Alper will be associated with Mr. Ralston in the California campaign.

Mr. James G. Blauvelt, president of The Henry George League of New Jersey, has arranged to supply the Pater-

son Library with the following books: six copies of "Progress and Poverty," six copies of "Social Problems," and six copies of "The Land Question." The Foundation is supplying three copies of "Protection or Free Trade," six copies of "The Life of Henry George," and six copies of "The Philosophy of Henry George," to match the donation which Mr. Blauvelt is making. Some notice of this may appear in the local Jersey papers, as the librarian has evinced friendly interest in seeing that the people of Paterson and environs know where they can get Henry George's books.

From Mr. White of Kansas City, Mo., we learn that a class of twenty teachers are studying "Basic Facts of Economics," by Louis F. Post, which books were placed at the disposal of these teachers through the cooperation of Mr. White and the Foundation.

Mr. H. C. Harris of Cordele, Ga., has placed "Progress and Poverty," "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty," and copies of "The Philosophy of Henry George" in libraries in Georgia, and is now starting to place "Social Problems."

We have been in constant touch, of course, with Mr. Monroe, field director for the Henry George School, in getting together a representative list of people in Ohio. His success in organizing four classes totaling 232 pupils in Cleveland has been amazing, and he reports that Messrs. Allen, Danaceau, Mickey, and Crudele are the instructors. In addition to supplying books we sent 850 pamphlets to Mr. Downer who will distribute them in connection with a radio speech by Peter Witt.

#### NEW PRINTINGS

Since the last report in LAND AND FREEDOM, two new and, we believe, interesting pieces of printed matter have been prepared and issued by the Foundation. First, a pamphlet by Mr. George L. Rusby entitled, "Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries, and Lower Wages, The Condition, The Cause, The Cure." Mr. Rusby has formerly published under his own imprint upwards of 150,000 copies. This sixth edition bears the Foundation imprint. Already 2,000 copies have been sold. The booklet presents a digest of "Progress and Poverty" with charts and other easily visualized material, and is therefore extremely popular with those who want to hand to a friend a thorough, yet short explanation of the Single Tax. Second, 15,000 copies of a book catalogue. Practically that number have been distributed within the short space of one month. This catalogue is the most complete catalogue issued by the Foundation to date, since it lists all of the books, smaller writings, and pamphlets that are available in any sizeable quantities from our shelves.

Following a mailing of the Rusby pamphlet to a few picked names on our list of professors and teachers, we received several requests for this booklet in quantities.

From the James Monroe High School in the Bronx, we received the following letter:

"If you will send me copies of the books and pamphlets which you have listed on your recent Book Catalogue List for April, 1935, I shall be glad to have them reviewed by at least two members of the appropriate departments."

Temple University in Philadelphia has ordered twenty copies of "Progress and Poverty" for classroom study.

A high school in West Lawn, Pa., has been supplied with pamphlets for its Economics Club.

Hundreds of orders for books have been received from libraries and book dealers as a result of the catalogue mailing. The orders that come from book dealers represent in large part a demand from local educational groups as well as an increased demand from the general public. We notice that whenever we send out a mailing, the indirect orders from book dealers immediately increase, which shows that our material is receiving effective attention from the public. During the last month, besides sending the catalogue and incidental pamphlets to all of the people on our main list, to professors and high school teachers, to recently enrolled students in the Henry George Extension Classes, and to editors, we circularized a list of officers of civic organizations interested in municipal betterment, and the result from this specialized list, as well as from the large mailing to the other lists mentioned, has been gratifying in that the demand for information and books on Henry George has been practically trebled.

In conclusion, and after taking inventory, we report the following distribution of 5,706 copies of George's works and miscellaneous books from May 10, 1934, to May 16, 1935: 2,837 "Progress and Poverty" unabridged; 7 "Progress and Poverty" abridged; 268 "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty;" 422 "Protection or Free Trade;" 881 "Social Problems;" 163 "The Land Question;" 195 "What Is the Single Tax?"; 55 "Basic Facts of Economics;" 146 "Science of Political Economy;" 82 "The Life of Henry George;" 110 "The Condition of Labor;" 158 "The Philosophy of Henry George;" 11 "The Prophet of San Francisco;" 43 "What's Wrong With Taxation?" 28 "The Story of My Dictatorship;" 300 Miscellaneous books.

Pamphlets distributed, 32,000, and advertising pieces distributed, 100,000.

During this time the following campaigns were launched; a total of 42,940 direct mail letters sent out during the year: 7,000 to launch "Social Problems;" 1,300 to book dealers in October; 3,000 to book dealers in May, 1935; 890 to business colleges in October; 4,000 to high schools in October; 1,500 to college professors in October; 250 in July re Rusby pamphlet; 8,000 enclosing "One Hundred Years of Land Gambling" in October; 7,000 Christ-

mas offer in December, 1934; 10,000 main list teachers, editors, etc., May, 1935, enclosing catalogue.

Estimating a daily correspondence of an average of twenty letters would fix the yearly correspondence rate at 6,000 letters.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN,  
Executive Secretary.

## On the March With John Lawrence Monroe

### ITINERARY

Indianapolis and vicinity, May 20-26, inclusive.

Cincinnati, Hamilton, Dayton, O., May 27-June 9, inclusive.

Columbus, Coshocton, Youngstown, O., June 10-June 23, inclusive.

#### CLEVELAND, O.

THE spirit of Tom L. Johnson is alive in Cleveland thirty-four years after his taking office as mayor and twenty-four years after his death.

Between April 2 and 12, Peter Witt, leading disciple of Cleveland's great Single Tax mayor, delivered seven addresses on the philosophy of Henry George over the Cleveland radio station, WGAR. The response of over 800 listeners asking for copies of the speeches is some indication of the large audience Mr. Witt must have had, and of the great interest in his message.

These names together with those of the Schalkenbach Foundation and the Ohio Economic League were immediately circularized with an announcement of a ten-weeks course in "Progress and Poverty" to commence Friday evening, April 19, and to be given under the auspices of the Henry George School of Social Science in Cleveland College. Cleveland College is the downtown branch of Western Reserve University. Its building is on the Public Square within a stone's throw of the statue of Tom L. Johnson which shows him sitting and holding a copy of "Progress and Poverty."

A surprise enrollment of over 230 made it necessary to form four classes (each one larger than it should have been). Three instructors had to be drafted in addition to Virgil D. Allen, extension secretary of the School and secretary of the Ohio Economic League. These were Karl B. Mickey, publicity director of the Cleveland Railway Company, and Saul S. Danaceau and Edward C. Crudele, prominent young attorneys. Mr. Allen himself is a civil engineer by profession and a former candidate for governor of Ohio on the Commonwealth Land Party ticket.

Former State Senator Marvin C. Harrison made an inspiring talk at the first meeting, recounting the story of how Tom Johnson drew the inspiration of his career from the book that was to be studied in the course, and emphasizing the need in Ohio and in the Nation for men and women who know its fundamental truths.

In the nine subsequent meetings the instructors are conducting their classes on a discussion basis, being guided by the Teacher's Manual of the School. Each lesson's questions are mimeographed and distributed as assignments. Page references in "Progress and Poverty" are included with the questions, indicating where the answers are discussed.

The students are a cross-section of the thinking people of Cleveland. Only a few have given any previous consideration to the subject though about thirty had copies of "Progress and Poverty" in their libraries and brought them. The average age of the students is probably little over thirty.

A survey of their occupations shows twenty-eight clerks, twenty-six in trades (such as mechanics, carpenters, printers, boilermakers, etc.), twenty-five salesmen and solicitors, thirteen secretaries and stenographers, twelve teachers, eleven engineers (civil, mechanical, etc.), eleven housewives, eleven accountants, ten business executives and managers, ten in professions (doctors, druggists, architects, musicians, clergymen, etc.), seven students, seven merchants and business men, six lawyers, six postal employees, five foremen, three librarians, and three social workers. Twenty-six were without occupations, four being unemployed and two retired.

A questionnaire answered by the students at the first meeting showed that thirty-four per cent had studied economics in high school, thirty-one per cent in college, forty-nine per cent "on their own," and thirty-one per cent not at all.

Other questions answered on this questionnaire give a cross-section of the thought of the students on such questions as What is wealth? What is capital? etc. The answers are being tabulated and at the close of the course the same questionnaire will be answered by the students. A comparison of the answers will show the progress of the class as a whole in economic thought. No check is made on any individual's answers. This questionnaire was based on the one prepared and used successfully by Noah D. Alper in St. Louis.

A commencement dinner is being planned to take place shortly after the close of the course on June 21. The Cleveland Extension Committee of the School is Peter Witt, Edward W. Doty, Marvin C. Harrison, Edgar S. Byers, and Edward S. Crudele.

\* \* \* \*

#### NOTES FROM THE FIELD

*Cedar Springs, Mich., April 25.* Mr. J. S. Tindall writes: "We have twenty-five enrolled in the class now. . . . All have books and read more or less, and discuss with me quite frequently. Some are deeply interested and by talking with others have been induced to join. . . . We are to meet at my house this evening as we have done for the past three meetings."

*Detroit, Mich., April 30.* Mr. Frank L. Morris writes:

"My class closed tonight very successfully. They all make fine converts to the cause. Especially is Mr. Wilson enthusiastic. . . . As for the Manual I consider it a great help. It is very thoughtfully and very thoroughly prepared. It seems to cover the cardinal points of every lesson. Its greatest help is in preparing the lesson for class. . . . To teach effectively, however, one should be so well prepared as to be somewhat independent of the Manual, permitting the Manual to be used only as a general guide."

*Detroit, Mich., May 9.* Mr. A. Laurence Smith writes: "We are trying to perfect arrangements to start the Extension Classes with the opening of the School year this fall. I am glad they are getting along so well in Cleveland and hope that we may put ourselves in position to do equally well."

*Toledo, O., April 25.* Speaking of his "Ladies Class" Mr. Robert L. McCaig writes: "I have nine now, with others to come, and hope to have about a dozen converts when the class is finished. We had our third meeting this evening and finished the second lesson. I am agreeably surprised with the results. All but three are young women not long out of school. . . . I am well satisfied that this class now not only knows that wages are not drawn from capital, but also that there are not too many people on this earth, nor that it is possible for there ever to be too many. They are now prepared to look elsewhere for the culprit that robs them and keeps them poor."—JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.

## Henry George Economics Class in Newark, N. J.

**T**HIS class opened at 17 Academy Street, Newark, Friday evening, March 1, under the leadership of Elizabeth E. Bowen, M.D.

No other evidence is needed of the success of this class than the following testimonial, presented to its leader at the last session, signed by twenty-four members, among whom were three lawyers, an accountant, an engineer and various other business men and women.

"Dear Dr. Bowen: It is with mingled feelings of regret that the fascinating hours spent so constructively during the past months have come to an end, and with genuine happiness that we have had the opportunity to acquaint ourselves with the philosophy of Henry George, that these words are written. In this period of economic distress, of social and political unrest and of rampant nationalisms, nothing seems to so analyze causes and to so surely suggest orderly remedy as your presentation of the economic doctrines of Henry George. In an era of concepts of bewilderment and confusion his plan stands sharply and boldly as the sole haven for the freedom of the individual in a healthy capitalistic society. This conclusion which has impressed itself upon our minds has been due, in no small part, to the masterful, tactful and tolerant manner in which the course was presented, and we subscribe ourselves to exert our best efforts in its universal adoption and operation, as the sole basis for the happiness of mankind."

That there was a sustained interest is shown by the fact that starting with an enrollment of thirty-one, the average attendance was twenty-three. One of the graduates is already organizing a class which he will lead.

## The Henry George School of Social Science

500 STUDENTS FOR THE FALL TERM

**T**HAT is the goal discussed at a meeting of the Student-Alumni of the Henry George School of Social Science held at the School on Wednesday, May 8, 1935. Enthusiasm mounted high as the graduate students sensed the possibilities for growth involved in this tremendous jump from this term to the next. Of course, they realized the importance of financial support to make this possible, but those best posted on that phase felt sure that it could be worked out satisfactorily.

It may be wise to indicate right here that the cost of getting students has been reduced each semester since September, 1933, and there is sound reason to believe that it can be still further reduced this coming term. Of course, this item will decrease with the increase in numbers aside from improvements in methods, to say nothing of the increments from the Student-Alumni Council as that body enlarges.

The creation of a staff of teachers to handle the increase in classes at the School already obtained has proceeded with gratifying results. Messrs. Smith, Fairchild and Heath have been enjoying themselves to the full in expounding George's philosophy to the newcomers and getting necessary experience.

The Extension Courses which had their inception with the publication of the "Teacher's Manual" is reported elsewhere in this issue.

It may not be generally known that the questions and answers given in the Manual were those developed and used by the late Oscar H. Geiger in his classroom work. No substantial changes were required or made. The manner in which these Manuals caught the attention of those interested in teaching economics from George's point of view has been a sound indication of the great need for this kind of a book. From the time that the advertisement first appeared in LAND AND FREEDOM under the auspices of the New York School, there has been a steady demand for information and this office has been as assiduous in mailing, correspondence, etc., as it has had the equipment to be.

With Mr. Monroe's coming into this particular work it seems a splendid avenue for growth has been opened up and one well calculated to end the wondering of the older ones as to "who will carry on the work when we are gone." The seed planted by George, Geiger, North and many others will bear fruit now that means have been found for attracting the attention of the young people and standardizing the method of teaching. Uniformity is strongly to be desired and by orientating the combined experiences of all of the classes in this and other places, that object can be completely obtained.

The following is a short account of the Student-Alumni Council meeting held May 8:

1. Three new members were elected to the Executive Committee to serve for three years: Mrs. Eva Maxwell, Mr. Max Berkowitz and Mr. Robert Clancy. Other members of this committee are: Miss Helen D. Denbigh, Mr. Leonard T. Recker, Mr. Henry George Atkinson, Mr. Morris J. Goldston, Mr. Charles Joseph Smith and Mr. John Luxton.

2. Two important committees were formed:

a. Library Committee to increase the number of books in the School Library from 1,000 to 5,000 volumes in two years, in order to comply with the requirements of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. The committee consists of Mr. Charles Erwood, chairman; Mrs. Margaret Bingham and Norman Fowles, Jr.

b. Newspaper Committee to prepare a School Paper for circularization among the Extension Classes. The committee consists of Mr. William H. Falconer, chairman; Miss Sophia Green, Mr. Robert Clancy and Mr. Max Berkowitz.

3. A vote of thanks to be sent to Mr. Leonard and Mr. Gene Recker for their splendid work on the pamphlet "Chained."

4. Election of officers of the Student-Alumni Council: Miss Helen D. Denbigh, president; Mr. Max Berkowitz, vice-president; Mr. Charles Joseph Smith, treasurer; and Miss Edith Lee Salkay, secretary.

The addition of Mr. Otto K. Dorn to the School office staff as Business Manager permits of a division of labor that ought to produce constructive results immediately. Under the plan the present director will be chiefly concerned with the class-work and the curriculum while Mr. Dorn will be in charge of business matters.

The entire staff has sensed that there has developed a need to model our curriculum in such fashion that current interest in related subjects can be utilized to draw those interested into the serious study of the science of economics as George elucidated it. There is, of course, not space to even outline that ambitious plan. It is the intention of the present director to attack that phase at the earliest possible moment.

Meanwhile, a careful study of the reactions and resistance of the classes has been going forward with a view to increasing enthusiastic reactions to George's arguments and lessening any resistances that may make conviction on essentials more difficult. In all this work there has been, to date, some falling off in the attendance. This, too, is receiving careful study. The attendance has been, it is true, better than we in New York have a right to expect but, nevertheless, every single absentee is noted, possible reasons explored and efforts to correct are maintained. Experience seems to indicate that the method of presentation has much to do with a falling off in attendance where attendance was at all possible.

In conclusion, the writer feels that after twenty-five years observation of the movement the School method is justifying itself as the most efficient in securing young, open-minded people getting a hearing for George's views, carrying conviction of the truth and arousing a desire to "do something about it." This is said without any effort to disparage the splendid work of others whether organized or unorganized.

Five hundred students for next September and it is believed it can be done!—N. C. B. FOWLES.

## Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

THE following officers and directors of the Club, constituting the Managing Board of the organization, were elected at a largely attended meeting of the members on April 16:

Charles H. Ingersoll, president; Anna George de Mille, vice-president; Walter Fairchild, general secretary; Elma Dame, recording secretary; Charles S. Prizer, treasurer and executive director.

John H. Allen, George H. Atkinson, Terese F. Burger, Amalia E. DuBois, Joseph Dana Miller, Harry Weinberger were elected directors.

Recognizing the national scope and character of the Club, the officers were directed by the meeting to create a general executive committee and to appoint a prominent Single Taxer in each State to constitute said committee. The work to be performed by the members of this committee is to assist in securing names for a new and comprehensive mailing list, to secure new members in each State, to build up the national scope and to carry into effect the programme of activities recommended from time to time by the Club.

The composition of the personnel of the newly elected Managing Board assures the close cooperation of the Henry George School of Social Science with the Club.

It is proposed that the graduates and the pupils of the Henry George School of Social Science be urged to join the Club, in which latter organization they will find incentive and opportunity to engage in active propaganda and practical political work for the Single Tax, which activities are not included in the curriculum or programme of the School.

IF half the effort applied by the American Federation of Labor during the past 40 years to strikes, squabbles and securing of futile restrictive legislation had been devoted to securing application of the teachings of "Progress and Poverty" there would today be neither unemployment nor poverty. So organized labor has its share of responsibility for the depression and resulting evils. Continuation of this neglect does not improve the indefensible position it has been occupying.

## A Message to Extension Classes of the Henry George School

WITH the rapid growth of our Main School and its thirty-three Extension Classes in fourteen States, it is important that the instructors, and alumni shall be able to share together clear and unified ideas regarding these two organizations—the local Student-Alumni Council, and the national (perhaps sometime international) Henry George Fellowship.

At the Henry George School of Social Science in New York, when we organized in April, 1934, as many of the Extension Classes are doing now—a year later, we called our organization the "Student-Alumni Council of the Henry George School of Social Science."

We drew up a set of By-laws, a copy of which will be sent on request. Our idea of the Student-Alumni Council is this:

That it is a group of students and graduates actively concerning themselves with finding out and supplying the needs of its local school; promoting comradeship amongst the various classes of their school; and seeking "to do any and all things conducive to the best interests of the Henry George School of Social Science." (See Article 11 of the By-laws).

Here is a list of "Suggestions for Activities" which have kept some of the members of our Student-Alumni Council busy this year. Several of these things were done individually by members; for others committees were formed; in some cases, groups worked spontaneously together.

1. Preparing a "Henry George Fellowship Muster-Roll" of the graduates of each class. (This can be done by the "artist" of the class.)
2. Preparing Teaching-Charts, and Posters.
3. Teaching a class in "Progress and Poverty."
4. Procuring, and caring for a bulletin board.
5. Securing speakers and audiences for forums, and procuring and distributing Single Tax pamphlets at these meetings.
6. Planning meetings (some social in nature) to weld the group together. We find a yearly "outing" excellent for promoting fellowship.
7. Securing pupils for existing and future classes.
8. Conducting research work.
9. Printing or mimeographing and distributing results of such research work.
10. Collecting books for reference library; later cataloguing and cross-referencing same.
11. Forming discussion groups.
12. Subscribing for informative periodicals for reading table, such as LAND AND FREEDOM, *No Taxes, Land and Liberty*, "democracy."
13. Keeping a map up to date showing the location of all Henry George classes, now numbering forty-two in fourteen States.

Mr. Chodorov is having a little brochure printed to be placed in the hands of each graduate entitled: "What Am I Going To Do About It?" He believes that the graduate must first "look to his conscience and his abilities

for an answer to this question;" and again, "It is his duty to advance the Educational Programme which, at this moment is the only thing we *can* do."

Having thus, in part at least, explained how local work can be carried on in the centers with the help of such a body as the Student-Alumni Council I feel it is vital that I now turn towards that great dynamic force in this movement:

### THE HENRY GEORGE FELLOWSHIP.

The Henry George Fellowship includes all the alumni of all the classes of the Henry George School wherever they are formed, unless they signify when the idea is presented, as suggested in the Manual near the end of the course, that *they do not desire* to belong.

To quote from one of Mr. Chodorov's recent letters: "Let it be a fellowship, a loose organization . . . freely entered into for the advancement of a common ideal . . . Henry George tells us that a free society is the most effective one."

One of the most valuable things that can be done *before you organize* is to gain a thorough understanding of the significance of the Henry George Fellowship. Then will be seen, even clearer, the place and function of such a body as the Student-Alumni Council in the movement.

If we look into the history of the formation of:

1. The Student-Alumni Council of the Henry George School of Social Science and
2. The Henry George Fellowship, it will help in making it evident that *they are distinctly two bodies*, though they can be represented by concentric circles; as indeed we did represent them at the time of their formation. (See design at top of the "Message", sent out in May, 1934. The Student-Alumni Council is there represented as the core of the Henry George School, which is again surrounded by a greater body, the Henry George Fellowship. Three concentric circles.)

The Student-Alumni Council and the Henry George Fellowship differ in aim, scope and organization. They both came into being on the evening of April 19, 1934, at the Henry George School in New York.

I. The Student-Alumni Council was formed to aid the director, Oscar H. Geiger, in the efforts he was making for the School. (Each center, as it grows, will need some such body to aid its director in his work.)

II. The Henry George Fellowship was launched by the students that same evening in response to a dream of Oscar H. Geiger's, with the lofty hope that it might become a nation-wide organization, with its members inspired by the teachings of Henry George, aiding the cause by their interest and effort.

An appeal for a "Fund for Free Scholarships," so that the student body might be enlarged, accompanied its announcement, May 28, 1934. Funds for Free Scholarships began to come in. In June, a month later, Oscar Geiger passed on, but this living memorial of his work, The Henry George Fellowship, survives and is growing steadily.

Its very name serves to inspire its members and to link the groups, uniting them into one body.

In such a great and growing unity there must be strength, strength at last, to make the ideal *real!*

The Henry George Fellowship is distinctly an Educational Fraternity, and has now as its President, Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, who has aided it incalculably in the following ways:

1. By bringing it before the Henry George Congress in Chicago,

October, 1934, when three resolutions concerning it were adopted. (See LAND AND FREEDOM, Nov.-Dec., 1934.)

II. By securing the services of Mr. John Lawrence Monroe as Field Director to establish classes in the leading cities of the United States.

The graduates of these classes are already swelling the ranks of the Fellowship.

As these classes, which now number forty-two, increase, it will be necessary to provide a paid secretary-treasurer; and it may be thought wise, also, to add another field director to keep the groups in touch with each other, or to work in new territory.

This will need funds.

Surely we shall not have to lack these!

I believe that every new class of graduates—members of the Henry George Fellowship—as soon as they realize the glorious and noble task before them, will respond to an appeal for a gift of money to be used in this Extension Work, “that others may see the star they see.” They will realize that *they* see it, because *others* who saw it made it possible for them to see it through their efforts. Though this must remain entirely optional with the various directors for the present, I feel that some Henry George Fellowship groups will soon respond in this way.

In thus heeding the words of the rallying call of the Henry George Fellowship—“Let Us Move Forward Together!”—they will prove their kinship with those who “trust Liberty and follow her,” so that “the dangers that now threaten” may disappear.

HELEN D. DENBIGH,

Vice Pres. Henry George Fellowship and Pres. Student-Alumni Council Henry George School of Social Science.,  
211 W. 79th St., New York City

## Washington Welcomes Judge Ralston

UNDISMAYED by a downpour of rain, about two dozen Single Taxers gathered at the home of Mr. Walter I. Swanton and his two daughters, Lucy and Edith, 1464 Belmont Street Northwest, Washington, D. C., on Monday evening, April 29, to greet Mr. and Mrs. Jackson H. Ralston on the last evening of their brief visit in the Nation's Capitol.

Asked to tell of conditions in California, Mr. Ralston gave an interesting and enlightening account of the efforts made during the fall of 1934 to get the requisite 116,000 signatures to an initiative petition calling for an amendment to the State constitution providing for land value taxation. The required number of signatures was not obtained in time for the election, but may be used in bringing up the amendment at the next national election, and the narrow margin by which they failed to get the measure on to the ballot last time has inspired the workers with hope of success next year, despite the forces against them, which include Governor Merriam, who will not call a special session of the legislature for fear the amendment will pass; William Randolph Hearst and other land speculators whose thousands of unused acres would be menaced; the newspapers, always subservient to the money interests; the bankers and insurance companies who fear possible depreciation in the value of mortgage holdings; and the school teachers, who have been carefully instructed that their salaries depend upon the continuation of the sales tax.

Mr. Ralston impressed upon his hearers the fact that if they wanted to do something for the cause, now was the accepted time, and urged all who could afford to do so, to send contributions to 83 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., care of the Single Tax Relief Campaign Committee, which is conducting an intensive campaign of education in that State. Judson King, Executive Secretary of the National Popular Government League, promptly responded with an offer of ten dollars as a beginning, and Mrs. Marie H. Heath, President of the Woman's Single Tax Club of the District of Columbia, stated that at their next annual meeting the following Monday evening, a committee would be appointed to see what they could do to help. Mr. Charles G. Baldwin, President of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, Representative Theodore L. Moritz of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Henry S. Julian, Special Attorney of the Department of Justice, were among those who joined in the discussion which followed.

Mrs. Jessie Lane Keeley extended an invitation to all present to meet at her home in Riverdale, Maryland, on Sunday, June 9, for the annual “family reunion” of Single Taxers, but wished it understood that no lunches were to be brought this time as this was to be her treat, by way of celebrating her retirement from the government service the latter part of May.

Refreshments were served, after which the guests bade Mr. and Mrs. Ralston good bye, with best wishes for the campaign which is being waged in California for the only permanent cure for economic depressions.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

## New York to Entertain Tenth Annual Henry George Congress

THE executive committee of the Henry George Foundation, after a canvass of its Board of Directors, has selected New York City as the place of meeting for the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress, and it is planned to meet during the first week in October.

The programme this year will be distinctly different in type from those of recent years and much of the time will be devoted to informal conferences and round-table discussions. In view of the remarkable growth of the Henry George School of Social Science and its extension branches in various parts of the country, it is expected that there will be a large representation this year of the younger element and special provision will be made for featuring reports and discussions dealing with this important new development in educational work.

The Second Annual Henry George Congress was held in New York City in 1927 and proved quite successful. As it is now several years since the East has had a Henry George Congress, a large and representative gathering is anticipated and no effort will be spared to make this year's convention of profit to all attending.

NOAH WEBSTER wrote in 1787 in his *Examination into the Leading Principles of the Federal Constitution Proposed at the late Convention at Philadelphia*, controverting Montesquieu's notion that virtue constituted the basis of government and stated that “A general and tolerably equal distribution of landed property is the whole basis of national freedom.”

## Legislative Advances

**SENATOR PEPOON** of Missouri has introduced the following resolution:

*Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring therein:*

That at the general election to be held in the State of Missouri on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1936, or at a special election to be called by the Governor at his discretion prior to such general election, there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of this State, for adoption or rejection, the following proposed amendment to the Constitution, to-wit:

Section 1. That Section 7 of Article X of the Constitution of the State of Missouri, be and the same is hereby repealed and a new Section adopted in lieu thereof to be known as Section 7, and to read as follows:

Section 7. The Legislature shall classify all property for purposes of taxation and may exempt from taxation for state purposes any class or classes of property in whole or in part. Any class or classes of property as classified by the Legislature may be exempted from taxation for county, city and school purposes in whole or in part, by vote of the people in any county, city or school district affected.

### TEXAS

The legislature at Austin has passed a bill authorizing the State Highway Commission to remove the barbed wire barriers erected by landowners in Kennedy County which now block the highway. It was pointed out that the land was assessed at only one dollar an acre.

### FEDERAL

Congressman Theodore L. Moritz of Pennsylvania has introduced a bill in the House for the taxation of land values. His speech introducing the bill and entitled "The Right to Live," is an excellent presentation of our principles. We regret that Mr. Moritz has thought it necessary to include a three thousand dollar exemption.

### OKLAHOMA

A graduated land tax measure has been introduced in the legislature. The *Oklahoma Union Farmer* is supporting the measure and a recent number shows a picture of four hundred farmers gathered at the state capitol clamoring for action on the bill. "Home lovers versus land hogs" is the burden of the farmers' petition to the legislature.

### WASHINGTON

State representative A. Lou Cobden has introduced a bill in the legislature exempting homes up to \$2,500. It will certainly get action at the next session. Eighty-five per cent of the Kings County delegation, which county includes Seattle, have pronounced in favor of it.

### PHILIPPINES

The new constitution of the commonwealth of the Philippines provides for the restriction of large land holdings.

## Land Value Tax Pays for \$50,000,000 Bridge

**HON. J. R. FIRTH**, Mayor of Strathfield, N. S. W., Australia, writes:

"The 1934 assessment of the City of Sydney total unimproved capital value of ratable land is £45,979,009.

"The rates levied for 1934 were:

The City Rate	-	-	-	4½d. in the £.
Bridge Rate	-	-	1/3 of a penny in the £.	
Main Roads Board Rate	-	-	7/32 of a penny in the £.	

"The City Rate is to pay the expenses of the local government of the City of Sydney.

"The Bridge Rate is to help pay interest and cost of the £10,000,000 bridge, connecting Sydney and North Sydney over the Sydney Harbour.

"The Main Roads Board Rate goes to help pay for the Sydney metropolitan area.

"If the rate, 5 and 5/96d., was struck on the unimproved value of the land, *before* it had been depreciated because it was ratable, the rate would, of course, amount to about nearly half the annual value. But when you remember that the rate itself depreciates the value of land at least twenty-five per cent, the rate of 5d. and 5/96 of a penny in the pound probably amounts to about one-third of the annual value.

"There is no agitation for taxing buildings. Any public man who suggested such a thing would cease to be a public man at the next election."

To what Mayor Firth has written it may be added that Sydney, Australia, has a population of a million and a half, being the second largest city in the British Empire. Sydney raises all its local taxation from land values. This includes roads and the new bridge. Sydney has no tax on buildings. It has no slums, no congestion.

**B**IG appropriations for munitions. That suits the munitions interests fine. Plowing under of crops. Without a sufficient food supply munitions won't help the army and navy much. "An army marches on its belly," you know. But the munitions trust does not sell food and so long as it gets its share the militarist statesmen in the Cabinet and in Congress are not really concerned about feeding the soldiers. Otherwise they would not stand for a moment for the plowing under business.

**T**HE New Deal has been in operation more than a year and still there are ten million unemployed. It could not be otherwise with thirteen billions of taxes being laid on industry without cessation and with most valuable land in the hands of speculators. And the pretended economists of the brain trust did not know this would be the case. How much longer is President Roosevelt going to let these quacks hold up removal of the cause of the depression?

**S**OME innocents expect the thirty hour week to increase employment and look upon it as a step toward the twenty hour week which, they figure, will increase employment more. After that they will demand a ten hour week and finally they hope to abolish unemployment entirely by reducing the working time to zero. Perhaps some mental giant, say President Green of the A. F. of L., can present some further arguments, equally strong.



## Miscellany

### SOCIALISM IS "SUPERADEQUATE"

I have always had an aversion to the term "Single Tax," which is really a nickname applied to the economic philosophy of Henry George.

The Georgian philosophy is really a just, an adequate socialism, for it never advocated the public appropriation of privately owned labor-created property as do those who follow the Socialistic doctrine according to Karl Marx.

The George followers advocate the public appropriation of land values by taxing the economic rent—that value which is not a labor creation, but rather a public one through the presence and activities of population—a public creation that is now privately appropriated and as a debit against private enterprise in the way of industry and exchange.

This term "Single Tax" has been the source of much misunderstanding of the philosophy in the public mind.

Some of the more conservative followers of the philosophy of Henry George do not advocate taking all the economic rent of land by taxation, but always leaving enough for a selfish incentive on the part of an individual to administer the land; that this would be more economical than its total appropriation and public administration.

Some of the still more conservative followers of the philosophy advocate taking only enough of the economic rent of land to pay the expense of government—a tax on land values for revenue only.

The basis of the Georgian philosophy is a simple, a just, an adequate Socialism—taking only that value which is publicly created, which belongs to the public, and freeing all labor creation through industry and exchange from a growing burden of taxation.

Roughly speaking, the history of every great reform since the beginning of civilization, is that someone proposed a simple and just remedy for a social injustice, as did Henry George in 1879, but those enjoying the fruits of the social injustice would not make compromise; the injustice went on from bad to worse and until the simple remedy was no longer radical enough for the radicals, and as now being proposed in the socialization of private industry.

The Georgian economic philosophy makes a very clear distinction between labor-created property values and publicly or socially created property values

Henry George once referred to the Socialistic philosophy of Karl Marx as being "superadequate."

DAVID GIBSON, in *Lorain Journal*, Lorain, O.

### E. J. CRAIGIE IN THE AUSTRALIAN HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

The leader of the opposition spoke of unemployment relief. He said that the people of Port Pirie complained bitterly that the rations allowed were insufficient. Of course, he conveniently forgot to state that that small amount of rations was carrying a heavy burden of taxation, and he forgot also his attitude when he was a distinguished member of the Commonwealth Parliament and did not hesitate to tax the food and clothing of the people of Port Pirie. If he takes the trouble to investigate the question he will find that in Port Pirie the total rates paid to the corporation amount to £17,000 a year and that the additional price paid by the workers at Port Pirie on sugar alone is £11,680 a year. This was caused through the efforts of James Scullin, the so-called labor leader, in the Commonwealth Parliament for a number of years. If the leader of the opposition is anxious to do something for these workers he claims to represent at Port Pirie he should direct his attention to the removal of the embargo on sugar and put about £11,000 a year into the pockets of the people of that town.

Mr. Dale—Sugar is not a State matter.

Mr. Craigie—That is the same old cry which is brought out each time. Mr. Dale knows perfectly well that he is now part and parcel of the great Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Dale—I have been a member for 40 years, and am proud of it.

Mr. Craigie—I would not be proud of it if I were in the honorable member's position. A party which has consistently taxed everything used by the working class has nothing to be proud of. He should hold his head in shame at being a supporter of a policy which has been disclaimed by every section of the Labor movement outside of Australia.

Mr. Stephens—You claim to be the only soldier in step?

Mr. Craigie—I claim to be the only true representative of Labor in this House. Mr. Beerworth started off by saying that the Liberals were financed by the banks. I do not know that any member has any definite information to make good a statement of that kind. I could, with great truth, say that when the last Federal election was fought a donation of £10,000 went to the Federal Labor Party from the sugar interests, £10,000 to the National Party, and £6,000 to the Country Party.

Mr. Dale—How much did your Party get?

Mr. Craigie—They do not give you anything when you are out to remove embargoes, but only when you are out to put them on. If Mr. Beerworth could carry his mind back to 1928 and read the leading article in "*The Australian Manufacturer*" of that time he would find it stated that the manufacturers of Australia were seriously considering withdrawing their support from the National Party and giving it to the Labor Party, because the latter would give them more privileges than the Nationalists were prepared to. Representatives of the working class want to be conversant with the whole of the facts before they throw bricks at some other fellow's glass house. Mr. Beerworth said that the solution of the problem was the shortening of the hours of labor to keep in touch with the advances made by machinery. While such advocates are keen on shortening the hours of labor and reducing the Commonwealth's production per individual unit, I presume they do not contend that the wages of labor shall be shortened correspondingly. If such is not the case, I would respectfully submit that to shorten the hours of labor and give the same remuneration would simply mean an increase in the price of commodities. When that increase took place the purchasing power of the people would once more be reduced. I suppose our labor friends would give as their solution "Let us shorten the hours of laboring men even more."

Mr. Dale—Henry Ford said that hours should be shortened and wages increased.

Mr. Craigie—He has said many things which do not stand examination. It is just as well not to rest on authority for any statement without understanding it, as one is likely to go astray. Members were also told by Mr. Beerworth that we had built up a high standard of living in Australia. While I listened to him my mind flew back to those villas we have on the banks of the Torrens, I wondered what was the standard of the poor unfortunates living there. When we look at the tens of thousands of people throughout Australia who are compelled under our bad economic policy to take Government relief as a means of subsistence it seems mockery on the part of Labor men to speak of a high standard of living in Australia.

### A HAPPY ILLUSTRATION

Collect all land rent for the public and abolish all other forms of taxation and business will come out of its stupor with the same acceleration that the State recently fought its way free of the grip of a blizzard. Just as removal of snow opened up first one car line, then another, first one road, then another, just so will removal of taxes open up thousands of opportunities for profitable employment until every man is re-absorbed in trade and industry.

ALBERT L. MEGGINSON, in *Wilmington, (Del.) Star*.

## COMING CLOSE TO US

There are grave defects in the system. The owners of land and capital receive in general just about what their property or their services are worth to society. But this does not work out fairly in many respects. Land is essential to life and extremely limited. It automatically increases rapidly in value with growth of population. The payment for it is not for services but merely for ownership. We reach a stage where a very large share of the total income is going to people who produce nothing. They merely hang on to land and receive an unearned income from the toil of those who work.

PROF. NEIL CAROTHERS, in Sunday *Herald-Tribune*, March 3.

## ORATION OF CHIEF SEATTLE

These paragraphs are the close of the remarkable valedictory oration delivered by the Indian, Chief Seattle, in 1854. He was speaking at the conference between Gov. Isaac I. Stevens and the Puget Sound Indians on the shores of Puget Sound where the city of Seattle now stands. The purpose of the conference was the ratifying of a treaty between the United States and Chief Seattle's tribe with reference to placing the tribe on restricted reservations. Like Black Hawk and other great Indian chieftains, Chief Seattle felt that the expropriation of the land was a wrong that would in time descend as a fatal evil upon his great white brother. This is the swan song of a race.—J. L. M.

\* \* \*

It matters little where we pass the remnant of our days. They will not be many. The Indians' night promises to be dark. Not a single star of hope hovers above his horizon. Sad-voiced winds moan in the distance. Grim fate seems to be on the Red Man's trail, and wherever he goes he will hear the approaching footsteps of his fell destroyer and prepare stolidly to meet his doom, as does the wounded doe that hears the approaching footsteps of the hunter.

A few more moons. A few more winters—and not one of the descendants of the mighty hosts that once moved over this broad land or lived in happy homes, protected by the great spirit, will remain to mourn over the graves of a people—once more powerful and hopeful than yours. But why should I mourn the untimely fate of my people? Tribe follows tribe, and nation follows nation, like the waves of the sea. It is the order of nature and regret is useless. Your time of decay may be distant, but it will surely come for even the White Man whose God walked and talked with him as friend with friend, cannot be exempt from the common destiny. We may be brothers after all. We will see.

We will ponder your proposition and when we decide we will let you know. But should we accept it, I have and now make this condition that we will not be denied the privilege without molestation of visiting at any time the tombs of our ancestors, friends and children. Every part of this soil is sacred in the estimation of my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove, has been hallowed by some sad or happy event in days long vanished. Even the rocks which seem to be dumb and dead as they swelter in the sun along the silent shore, thrill with memories of stirring events connected with the lives of my people, and the very dust upon which you now stand responds more lovingly to their footsteps than to yours, because it is rich with the blood of our ancestors and our bare feet are conscious of its sympathetic touch.

And when the last Red Man shall have perished, and the memory of my tribe, and when your children's children think themselves alone in the field, the store, the shop, upon the highway, or in the silence of the pathless woods, they will not be alone. In all the earth there is no place dedicated to solitude. At night when the streets of your cities and villages are silent and you think them deserted, they will throng with the returning hosts that once filled them and still love this beautiful land. The White Man will never be alone.

Let him be just and deal kindly with my people, for the dead are not powerless. Dead, did I say? There is no death, only a change of worlds.

## DEFINITIONS OF LIBERTY

I AGREE heartily with that part of your editorial, "The Liberty League," which welcomes intelligent criticism of the New Deal. But to expect such criticism from the American Liberty League is, I fear, to expect figs to grow from thistles. I do not mean to pass judgment upon the motives of the league's sponsors, but I question their understanding of the meaning of liberty.

This skepticism arises from the fact that they all are essentially politically minded. The roots of liberty go deeper than politics; deeper than a mere political document like the Constitution of the United States, which the league purposes to defend and uphold. Mere political liberty, history should have taught us, is a mockery. Genuine liberty has its roots in ethics and economics.

The twofold purpose of the league is announced as the teaching of (1) the necessity of respect for the rights of persons and property, and (2) the duty of government to protect private enterprise. A highly laudable purpose! But, as you astutely remark, it "can mean much or little, depending upon how it is applied." Moreover, in order to teach the necessity of respect for rights of persons and property, teachers must first know something of the basis of those rights.

Such knowledge would save them from an almost universal confusion, exhibited by yourself when you warned against the difficulty of adjudicating conflicts between personal rights and property rights. There is, and can be, no conflict between rights of persons and of property; the conflict is between erroneous conceptions of those rights. Property rights grow out of personal rights—out of a man's right to himself, and to the fruits of his own labor, both manual and mental. Violation of either right is violation of the other.

There are two kinds of property and two kinds of property rights—social and private. It requires no unusual analytic powers to distinguish between the two. Certain values are obviously the product of individuals or private groups and, by their very nature, private property. Others, such as land values and most technological inventions, are the product of the whole complex of communal effort making for economic and social and cultural development, in which the individual contribution is indistinguishable; these values, by their very nature, are the property of society as a whole.

Failure to make this simple, but profound, distinction has prohibited genuine liberty and abridged even the specious liberty our political institutions permitted us. This failure produced a system of land-tenure and taxation which violates both social and private property rights; social rights, by permitting the private appropriation of socially created values; private rights, by use of the taxing power to confiscate private property for public purposes in lieu of the socially created values.

Our foolish and futile efforts to avoid the inevitable results of this denial of elementary rights have resulted in the progressive abridgment of liberty through passage of laws setting up all manner of governmental interference with legitimate private enterprise. One example of the futility of all these laws is the anti-trust legislation to prevent excessive concentration of wealth (they were further nullified by "protective tariffs" which also effectively fostered monopoly). To cite all the follies growing out of the failure to distinguish social and private property would take volumes; but another is the vicious struggle between the ignorant armies of capital and labor, and between right and left. The right has no respect for social property rights, nor the left for private property rights, nor either for liberty.

The conservatives who now are bewailing the abridgment of liberty under the New Deal are just as much to blame for it as Mr. Roosevelt and his befuddled reformers: the New Deal is just the continuation of an old process to which they until now consented. If the New Deal is full of anomalies and injustices and demagoguery; if it is taxing the

producer more murderously than any past administration in order to preserve monopoly and foster bureaucracy; if politics under it has degenerated into a meaningless maze of sound and fury—the cause is an ignorance of, and an indifference toward, rights and liberty shared equally by all shades of politically minded opinion, whether reactionary, conservative, New Deal, avowed Socialist or Communist.

KARL B. MICKEY in *Cleveland Press*.

#### "UNEARNED INCREMENT"

AS the new dealers deal and the nation wrestles with economic problems of unprecedented magnitude, there arises occasionally one of those who still cherish the idea of "the single tax" or are otherwise disciples of the late Henry George.

Every so often an example is cited where the "unearned increment" of a piece of property reaches a staggering sum, and someone, a Georgist or a potential one, arises to protest.

And, indeed, the "unearned increment" argument has never been convincingly refuted. Today in our colleges and universities professors in economic class rooms discuss the ideas of Henry George with their students and the injustice of a land owner or his heirs profiting enormously as a result of population pressure and other factors is pointed out.

Typical of such discussions is an article contained in the current issue of *Unity* by James G. Blauvelt, from which the following is taken:

There was a vacant block of land in New York owned by a subsidiary of the N. Y. Central Railroad which leased it to the Waldorf-Astoria hotel at an annual rent, to begin with, of \$300,000, increased to \$600,000 in 1932, and increased \$50,000 every five years until 1956, when the yearly rent would be \$800,000, when a new lease is to be made. Who made that value? Not the railroad, though it contributed, as did all other activities of everybody else, fire and police protection, great waterworks, sewers, streets, parks, bridges, tunnels, airports, streets and highways, hospitals, schools, colleges, churches, art, literature, commerce, the greatest stores in the world, great newspapers and the presence of millions of people providing activities of every kind.

Why should the railroads have what millions of people have made? The rental of that land should go to the public treasury. The land belongs to the people and so does the income of it.

The Astors bought the property where the Empire State building now stands, for a few thousand dollars. They sold it to Al Smith and his associates for \$15,000,000, and William Waldorf Astor trotted off to England with his half, seven and one-half millions, on the interest of which he and his children, to the end of their time, can ride on the backs of the people. Such a system is a curse. It so distributes wealth that it is a public menace. No graft ever disclosed in public life compares with this enormous gift to the Astors of a value all of the people had created and morally owned.

The recovery administration is so busy with codes and crops that never a minute has been spared to look at a picture which a good many Americans believe is eminently unfair. Henry George's "Single Tax" as a remedy no longer has much liberal support, but perhaps before the present phase in our economic life is passed, a page or two may be taken from the Georgist philosophy and modernized to fit the new deal.

*The Progressive*, ROBT. M. LAFOLLETTE, Editor.

#### FROM THE HILLS

Offhand a liberal would regard this slum clearance programme as a noble bit of constructive work on the part of the government, yet when you analyze it out a bit there are fundamental objections.

Generally speaking, anything that raises the standard of living, that provides a better family environment, I am for it, but if along with such improvement goes renewed slavery to the god of greed, then my enthusiasm begins to stutter and backfire.

If the government confiscates these slum sites and erects model tenements, that's fine, but if the government pays an exorbitant price

for these sites and then makes a pleasant place where before there was a plague spot, the government has raised immensely the value of the adjoining private property and the rents on the private tenements will be jerked up.

I am most enthusiastic for these co-operative farm communities where unemployed and their families can begin to create their own living and also a surplus to be traded for necessities that they do not produce.

But I see where Uncle Sam bought the farms of 22 farmers to start one colony and I know that Uncle Sam has thousands of farms that he has taken over on federal loans and that he is offering for sale at private bid. Why not put the farmless farmer on the farmerless farm; indeed why not keep the farmer on his farm, instead of throwing him out and trying to get another poor fish to undertake the load of interest and mortgage payments and taxes and the rest?

If western cities would quit trying to sell these thousands of lots that have been taken over on street assessment debts and would enable jobless gardeners to use these lots, the bread lines would shorten before these "relief" bureaus. Handing our salt pork, beans, flour really doesn't get either civilization or the jobless anything but a temporary belly relief. Nobody need go hungry in this country if idle men and idle land can get acquainted.—HILL BILLY, columnist in *Seattle Star*.

#### SOUTH AMERICANS ARE FOOLISH, TOO

Economic blindness seems to follow the same channels the world over. Down in Brazil more than 63,000,000 pounds of coffee are being destroyed with the idea that growers of this highly valuable article of food will receive a better price for their products. Ridiculous and senseless of course, but no more so than the action of the federal government in forcing the destruction of thousands of acres of cotton in Mississippi and other southern states on the absurd theory that the way to attain riches is by destroying wealth.

One wonders if in Brazil the policy of destruction is carried to the extremes it is in America? Do the Brazilians levy a tax on themselves to pay themselves for destroying their own cotton? And do they pass laws, in their wild desire to rid themselves of their wealth, designed to fine the little producer who keeps his wealth at home and reward the great foreign owner of the land who ships his wealth abroad? If not, the Brazilians can come to America and learn a few wrinkles in the destruction of wealth by government decree. The officials of both federal and state agricultural departments are experts in the destruction of wealth and will gladly give our distressed neighbors to the south a few pointers on how best to destroy those things they have gone to great pains and expense to produce.

It never occurs to our dumb officials, the same as it never occurs to the dumb officials of Brazil, that to attempt to raise the price of agricultural products by their destruction, even though such a procedure accomplished new money without borrowing a thin dime from anybody, since the government made nearly three billion dollars in clear profit on the revaluation of gold.

The writer is not a veteran of the World War nor the Spanish American War, but I am fighting in defense of the principles involved and for the sake of downtrodden suffering humanity. I dare to call an axe an axe, and a spade a spade. "Big Business" is running America lock, stock and barrel, and unless the plain people take the bull by the horns and start to doing a few rounds for their own beloved America, we are just entering into the real depression ahead of us, instead of being behind us.

False optimism is more dangerous than an angry army. Let America give the men who saved America the just debt due them and do it quickly. An ungrateful Nation never did and never will prosper—it is defeated already.—*The Jeffersonian Democrat*, Jackson, Miss.

This paper is supported in the main by subscriptions. Will those who are delinquent kindly note this and rush their renewals?

**L**AND and women were the chief causes of strife (among the tribes).

The actual condition of society was principally determined by the nature of the ownership of the land. . . . The land-owners were the men of independence and power. The landless were dependent upon them for their support, and for nearly everything else.

What is law without legislation cannot be made MORE law by enactment.—LAW: Its Origin, Growth and Functions. (Carter 1907).

## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE STORY OF MANHATTAN'S LANDED WEALTH

Arthur Pound. The Macmillan Company \$3.50

A young Hollander, visiting New York City recently, said that he would be perfectly willing to pay double what his ancestors gave the Indians for the Island of Manhattan, if by so doing he could gain title to this greatest bit of golden earth on the globe. And, could he have done so in the golden days, his title would have been fully as justified as that of most of the owners of these golden acres today. It is not they who have made the values that sound like a fairy-tale. It is everything else that has meant the growth and development of our country's chief city, the great metropolis that started,—and still centers, on a rocky island between two rivers, a stretch of land which, as the author of this book says, "would be worth for agricultural purposes little more than an equal average of hill-and-valley Vermont land. Its rents have been lifted by trade, by the activities of aggressive and far-sighted persons evolving a complex society, until at last *whatever increases wealth anywhere on earth sooner or later marks up values between the Battery and the Bronx.*"

The history of Manhattan's landed wealth is the history of New York City. And it is engagingly told in this book; the true development of the great town, the growth of its importance, and the golden stream of wealth that pours out of its rocky barren acres, wealth which, as Mr. Pound stresses and underscores, was not the creation of any one individual who lived and worked on those acres, but the result of all that makes New York what it is, the second greatest city in the world, the city built upon the most valuable land on our planet. The poor Manhattos, he tells us, who sold their island to the Dutch West India Company for trade goods worth twenty-four dollars, considered they had driven a good bargain. So they had, as far as the worth of the island to them was concerned. What made the island richer than Golconda was human activity on a scale and of a complexity of which the natives were incapable.

Again and again, the author underscores the truth shown so plainly in the history of Manhattan Island, . . . and yet still not understood, or if understood not fully acknowledged, . . . the truth that it is not fertility nor natural beauty that counts in land values, it is location value alone that makes "golden acres." The world has no clearer example than this little stretch of rocky ground of the fact that the movements of armies and navies, the progress of invention and transport, the thrift of savers and the daring of adventurers, the march of religion and the channels of dissipation all contribute to and register their influence on land values, assessments and sales prices of realty. (This last sentence is from the "jacket blurb," something the practiced reviewer usually dislikes. But Macmillan jacket blurbs are good, as a rule!)

Many clever and entertaining books concern themselves with the history of this our greatest city. And, if I may be personal, I have read many of them because of old allegiance to and interest in the home of my ancestors for many generations back. But in the majority of these books the chief gauge of the city's growth is not mentioned, or if at all, only as a curiosity. Mr. Pound's book gives real enjoy-

ment to a lover of Manhattan's history because of the very live pictures it shows us of the social, commercial and political life of the city since its beginnings. But he keeps always before our eyes the great economic truth of which this Island of Manhattan is the most striking proof.

Mr. Pound proclaims again and again, and proves by example, just what it is that makes land values. Not the labor of one individual but the sum of activity of many individuals, the demand for land that makes the one true gauge of value, location value.

Believe it or not, it is still sadly necessary to hammer this self-evident fact into the brains of many well-meaning individuals who do not see "how we can assess, justly and accurately, the value of land alone."

Mr. Pound at least knows what makes land values. He does not, in his book, show any hint of further reasoning on how that value can be utilized for a city's needs. But we here, in LAND AND FREEDOM can safely recommend his book. Both for those who can learn much from it, and for those who can use the facts he gives in our endeavors to put over the fundamental economic truth in which we believe.

It is interesting to learn that the Dutch West India Company, the first "owners" of the island, would not permit settlers to own land at first, they leased it from the company. But as the company used the revenue from the leased land for its own profit, the result was much the same as conditions on feudal estates in Europe of that day. So that the sturdy, industrious and independent Dutchmen did not approve of the relation, and soon forced actual sales, giving them the land as "property." These early Dutch settlers were after trade and profit only; which, as Mr. Pound says, "is precisely what New York City is after." But they came from the most tolerant nation in Europe and had no burning zeal for any religious or other conformity. They were kind and just to the Indians and to white newcomers of any confession. Something which can also be said of New York City today.

The stage of company-leased land was followed by "patroonships," which were nothing more nor less than medieval feudalism, and did not last long. Contrary to the general idea, this stage of patroonships, while it gave names to parts of the city and to many nearby counties and towns, was not the source of any great landed fortunes of today. To these Mr. Pound comes by slow but exact degrees and shows how they were all based on personal initiative . . . i. e. on the understanding of the one way to secure a lasting and growing income, by letting the rest of the city do the work. Land speculation began early in the colony's history while it was still ruled by the company. But the company did not like the idea, felt it was being robbed and "deprived of its prerogatives. In 1651 Governor Stuyvesant was told to look sharply into these cases, to refuse grants except on acknowledgment of the company's authority and an examination of the applicant's means to populate, cultivate and bring under good tillage." An excellent principle for any community to act upon. Only here, unfortunately, as it was a case of mere company profits, the lesson could not be read by those who came after, and the golden acres drifted into private ownership.

We see the little village on the island's tip; the outlying "Bouveries," the farms surrounding New Amsterdam, that were the first large grants of land, to be held only on proof of "means to cultivate and bring under good tillage."

Then we follow the city during the English occupation, broken into by another period of Dutch possession, until it returned to the English, already a city by that time, and finally became part of the new "United States." At first, though, New York was second to Philadelphia. Development of water traffic up the Hudson and then the opening of the great interior lands to settlement and commerce had to come before the island city could take its present place as busiest port and gateway to the entire country.

We see each stage of this fascinating history, each stage by which Manhattan land progresses from a one-time top-price of seventy-seven

cents a square foot to the present day top-price of \$30,000 for one square foot.

After the first half of the book, devoted to the beginnings and slow early growth of the island city, Mr. Pound takes its second half to show beginnings and growth of the great landed fortunes of today's New York City. The city's history itself is shown in the story of the piling up of these stupendous incomes. One chapter each is given to such corporations as Trinity; Columbia University; and Sailor's Snug Harbor, leading examples of associations owning city land. Then come individual fortunes; the rise of the Astors "growing up with the land;" "those wierd Wendels" who have a chapter to themselves; and then the lesser lights, (but still important land-owners) the Goelets, Rhinelanders, Schemerhorns, and the descendants of the Bixby who "against his will" gave his note for \$200, for the purchase of a Murray Hill farm, and sold it later in parcels bringing in \$1,500,000 in cash "and I value what I have left at two or three times as much."

Although the land of Manhattan Island was on the assessment rolls in depression years as having a value of \$8,000,000,000, Mr. Pound calls that a rock-bottom figure. In ordinary times, he says, ten billion would be a conservative figure. He does not reason further as to the convenience to the city of a just income for its present needs, from these golden acres. But he does speak and quite plainly, about the "designedly bad management" which built up the liability of Greater New York's debt of \$2,500,000,000 on so rich a terrain.

In his closing words Mr. Pound diplomatically slides out from under the imputation of his whole book, i. e., that there might be something wrong in the private enjoyment of public-made values in New York City. But before he comes to this apparent disavowal of the facts he shows so clearly, he says the following, which is worth quoting.

"Want and wealth as companions are unknown in primitive societies where distributional processes are simple. Either he who has divides, or the destitute relieve him of part of his burden by main strength. But between the poor and the rich who live on Manhattan's golden earth today stands firmly a police force of more than 19,000, sometimes referred to as 'the finest.' This may not be an exceptionally able force in putting down crime . . . yet one who sees them on riot duty perceives what a truly efficient body the police are. Observing them at such times, one concludes that Manhattan's golden earth will continue severally owned for some time to come."

After such words, and after the lesson of the entire book, one cannot but regret, and wonder at, the closing page of apology for the present situation. We who have enjoyed the book can overlook this moment of renegation and come back to its keynote in the delightful and quotable sentence: "All things come to those who own land in the right quarters."—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### THE VOICE OF VERDUN

Elm Publishing Co., 115 Elm Street, St. Louis, Mo.

This is the title of a real war story by Elmer Naslund, of St. Louis, sometimes called "The Modern Village Blacksmith." Out of his fiery experience he has told a masterful story. You are swept along with the force of a machine gun.

Through the agony of the Argonne you accompany the author who experienced it all. It is all told in narrative form, revealing on every page the utter futility of war, of which the author, avoiding preachment, is quite convincing. You meet Petain, Joffe, Pershing and you live again the life Mr. Naslund's hero lived, which the writer himself lived, with the inevitable romance which sweetens the story. A word as to his war record will be of interest:

He served fifteen days on the left bank of the Meuse (Verdun); served 120 days in the Argonne from La Croix St. Pierre, to Dervans, Neuville being the center of the sector, opposite Varennes; served sixty-two long tortuous days on the right bank in front of Forts Douaumont and Vaux where he won a Croix de Guerre for bravery under

fire in the shadow of grim old Fort Douaumont. This service was with the 26th French Colonials.

Then came the great troop movement and he found himself before Soissons with the 156th French Colonials. As the division swept over the Aisne he was severely wounded, just west of Soissons. The attack was on Army scale and his division was part of the mighty Xth Army of Mangin.

Out of over two years in France, comes this powerful picture of the war. Out of a song at twilight in the famous Death Valley of Verdun is woven the thread of romance in the story.

It is a great book written with tremendous force. We sense the flying shells and hear the thunders of battle. The author's words are like flying bullets, sometimes with a disregard of rhetoric, but always with intense power. For occasional errors of spelling we must blame the printer and the proof reader. It is good news that Mr. Naslund is engaged on another book which will have an economic setting, so much needed at this time when the problem of war needs a lot of clarifying. Mr. Naslund has a faculty of story telling and a strange power of words. It is of interest to know that he is an unusual and forceful speaker.—J. D. M.

#### A HELPFUL BOOK

"What of Tomorrow?" By Ogden L. Mills. Macmillan Company, N. Y. City, Price \$2.

This book consists of nine addresses delivered by former Secretary of the Treasury Mills between December, 1933, and December, 1934. Mr. Mills is a clear thinker, and in the field of economics is generally on solid ground. With the exception of the last address on "Unemployment Insurance," which is banal, his papers are provocative and stimulating. Throughout runs the fear of inflation. With good reason. Mr. Mills sees the handwriting on the wall. Mankind will not much longer tolerate an unjust economic system; something drastic is in the offing.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Mills, clear thinker that he is, fails to see the economic problem through to its fullest implications. Were he familiar with the philosophy of the greatest economist the world has yet produced, he would see that so long as our earth is permitted to be privately owned; so long as landlords may misappropriate wealth which labor and capital have produced, so long must chaos and misery obtain.

He admits "Individual liberty can not long survive the death of economic freedom" and "we are pledged to maintain equality of opportunity for all." (Page 109).

HOW CAN THERE BE "EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL" WHEN SOME CLAIM TO OWN OUR EARTH ON WHICH ALL MUST LIVE?

In so-called "good times" we have had constantly between one and two million men unable to find employment. We have never had economic freedom and therefore never had liberty.

"In the new world the creative power of the individual human spirit was suddenly freed. Under this dynamic impulse, we see a young and weak nation master a continent, grown into one of the mighty peoples of the earth and by whatever standard you care to measure, achieve a greater degree of progress in one century than all mankind in the preceding two thousand years . . . And these accomplishments are due not to the wisdom of princes and rulers, but to the virtues, character and energies of the people themselves, living under a *system of government that brought unlimited opportunities to all men.*" (Italics mine). Pages 38-39.

"Under economic liberalism in 150 years the world progressed further in terms of the well being of average men and women than in all the previous centuries." (Page 69).

It was not the system of government that brought unlimited opportunity. It was the fact that land was freely available; that land rent was yet non-existent or nominal. Under a government such as the Founders envisioned, where free speech, free press, religious freedom,

representative government were to prevail; where men might exercise their "unalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," the human spirit was to be released, to give expression to its best and noblest self. In such an atmosphere the creative impulse would flower as never before. Mr. Mills fails to note that men could give expression to their full creative capacities only so long as land was free. When the last frontier had been conquered and land rent came into existence, economic freedom was at an end. When the *many* were compelled to pay the *few* for *mere permission to live and work* on our earth "equality of opportunity for all" was forever gone.

Mr. Mills fails to observe that it is this unjust system of land tenure which causes all our difficulties. Not once does it receive his recognition or condemnation.

We wonder if it is because he is a beneficiary?

His insistence on individualism as opposed to paternalism would be more convincing did he understand the distinction between what truly constitutes individual property rights and socially created community values, and did he espouse the Georgian philosophy which is the only philosophy which perceives these distinctions.

Certainly Socialism, Communism, and Fascism do not. The danger to Mr. Mills, and his class, is that any rights they have may be swept away by the blind fury of the American people if they should embrace any of these crazy philosophies.

Among the causes of low prices of agricultural products, Mr. Mills mentions "excess of production" (Page 74). Is he familiar with Prof. Kemper Simpson's "Introduction to World Economics" which shows that in 1929 we produced only one overcoat per man in five years, one ready made suit per man in two years, one sleeping garment per man in two years, and three shirts per man in a year. The total production of woman's clothing per woman in 1929 was valued at only \$22.12! In the same year only three handkerchiefs per person were manufactured; only \$6.36 worth of soap per family; only \$.19 worth of tooth brushes. Even our production of food has never been adequate to meet our needs. We find deficiencies of three and one half billion gallons of milk, three quarter billion pounds of butter, one and three quarter billion pounds of citrus fruits, twenty billion pounds of other food and vegetables, and nine hundred million pounds of beef. (Page 16).

Mr. Mills advocates "creation of work" and "assistance to special classes of debtors such as home owners and farmers temporarily incapable of meeting obligations because of extraordinary conditions." (Pages 74-75).

That human beings possessing their natural, God-given rights to their earth need no such stimulants; that such palliations are contrary to the American principle of freedom and individual initiative; that all we need is to establish an economic order of true equality, Mr. Mills nowhere makes clear.

Although well written, and properly condemnatory of the Roosevelt policies, Mr. Mills' book must be dismissed as futile because of his failure to place his finger on the true cause of our ills.—B. W. B.

### IN THE SHADOW OF GOLD

Paul Studer. 232 pages. Greenberg, Publishers, N. Y. City.

Primarily a novel written in exotic style as propaganda to advance the theory that gold is the fundamental cause of all economic disturbance and that we are all "slaves of a bad monetary system." The author's programme calls for the abolition of gold or of any metallic base of money, also of all bank notes and to do away with all elements of money which "enslave the people." He advocates commodity money whose value will always be the same (page 216) and calls this "fair, sound, honest money."

We quote in substance some of the ideas outlined: "The most conspicuous characteristics of depression is scarcity of money." This is a rather curious point of view as regards the present depression with interest rates at one per cent and banks loaded with money to lend. The author notes the destruction of bill currency and observes

the more money destroyed the more valuable the remaining supply grows. So, as a result, there is less money to purchase goods and a lessening of demand causes wholesale destruction of things money would buy such as crops, pigs, coffee, etc., these items now being "worthless." He apparently believes there is such a thing as general overproduction and has some leanings toward the Malthusian theory.

In order to counteract the control of money by those he calls the "money magnates," plants are created which are able to turn out perfect counterfeit money and as the money magnates attempt to depress the market by selling stocks an unlimited supply of money constantly absorbs the offerings. This confounds the magnates and leads to the discovery of the counterfeiting and the principals are tried and found guilty. Nevertheless, a long explanation is allowed before the court and transmitted by radio to all the world, showing the counterfeiters to be public benefactors, e. g., the power of money has been broken and people may now live a contented life with less exertion because the great hindrance to human development has been removed.

Just how so-called "money magnates" change their ways so suddenly is not considered. Getting rid of stocks at falling prices accompanied by an increasing purchasing power is not phenomenal. Who gets the tangibles and who keeps the paper is also not outlined. The billions in bill money received in exchange for the world-wide lightening transactions in stocks, presents a picture which would delight transportation and warehouse interests.

The whole argument is that supply and tangibles are one and money only is demand. The idea that production of one form of wealth is the demand for other wealth is not in the book nor does it occur to the author that money is not wealth at all. Also he fails to understand that if money as a medium of exchange does not represent wealth produced it is worthless and no one would exchange anything of value for it.

Shades of paper marks, the same old gods with the old faces altered slightly. The golden eagle gives way to the blue and now a new emblem may be in sight and a counterfeit billion dollars by a government printing press may yet buy a hamless sandwich and a glass of near beer.

We have other books on this order on our shelves which explain human fallacies and enable us to understand why some clerics, some senators and others may count on a sure following of the "lunatic fringe."—C. H. K.

### THE MEANING OF MONEY

E. C. Riegel, President Consumer's Guild of America. Publisher, Empire Books, N. Y. Price \$2.00.

In this book Mr. Riegel has contributed a distinct service to the gaiety of economics.

Briefly Prof. Irving Fisher of Yale indicated in a public address that most persons who undertake to discuss money do not understand the subject and that those "who understand the real meaning of money" are few in number.

Mr. Riegel thereupon writes Prof. Fisher inviting him to name a few. In reply Prof. Fisher named ten, generously excluding himself, as not an exclusive list of persons who "understand the meaning of money."

Mr. Riegel then offered a questionnaire to the ten persons named, adding Prof. Fisher to the list. Several economists and one banker responded to the nine questions and sub-questions. Mr. Riegel here offers a symposium outlining all answers to each question and himself reviewing and commenting on the replies. At the close Mr. Riegel gives a general review of the symposium.

The questions are well put and thoughtful and in line with current inquiry. The replies are revelations in the fact that hardly any two agree on any question adds to the educational value of the book. The book merits a study by those interested in reading it carefully

and even though in disagreement, each reply gives a very interesting view-point.

In friendly criticism we would add our own point of view regarding money: Money itself is not wealth. When money is issued against metal that metal, as a labor product, is wealth. Other money if unsecured, is credit money, but it must represent wealth produced or land value and must be backed by the government taxing power.

C. H. K.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

### E. J. CRAIGIE DOES A FINE PIECE OF WORK

"A Study in Central Melbourne Land Values" is a pamphlet of thirty-six pages and cover prepared by E. J. Craigie, M. P. We become acquainted with the pioneers of Melbourne, named in honor of Lord Melbourne; its first established government in 1837; and the sale of the land by the government for £6,916 now worth (unimproved value) £23,000,000.

We learn of many instances which illustrate the growth of land values and the great fortunes that fell to many of the lucky gamblers. Thus a Mr. Browne bought one of the allotments. Thinking he had made an unprofitable purchase he sold it to the Wesleyans for a chapel site. In the course of time the Wesleyans sold it for one thousand times the amount paid by Mr. Browne.

This is only one of the cases of unearned wealth cited in this amazing little work. Mr. Craigie tells us that land that was sold for from £30 to £40 per half acre is now worth approximately £2,000 per foot. And of course, and as a consequence, there are great numbers of unemployed in Melbourne.

The title deeds drawn up by John Batman with three of the aborigines in 1835 reveal that Melbourne was sold for twenty blankets and twelve tomahawks. The curious title deeds confirming the transactions are under glass at the Melbourne Public Library. It is some satisfaction to record that the Home Government annulled the whole transaction.

Mr. Craigie has done a neat piece of work in gathering this material into pamphlet form. His comments are always arresting, as for example:

"It is a well provisioned ship, this on which we sail through space. If the bread and beef above decks grow scarce we but open a hatch and there is a new supply of which before we never dreamed. And very great command over the services of others comes to those who as the hatches are opened are permitted to say, This is mine."

J. D. M.

### FRANK STEPHENS IN A NEW GUISE

"Grub's Corner or the Dutch on the Delaware" is an operetta by Frank Stephens, the musical score of which is by Estelle Hillersohn from the operettas of Gilbert and Sullivan.

The prologue is written by Frank Stephens in a happy vein. He tells us that "Of course he could have written the music as well as the words but like most of our fellow citizens we were in too much of a hurry to make anything fresh when we could pick them up already canned."

He tells us in this prologue: "It brings together historic personages who never met, in places where they never were and at times when they were not alive. It includes in one day's action events which befell nigh a century apart."

Nevertheless, it typifies real historic happenings and teaches a useful lesson in land grabbing, its phases and consequences, and the actual bases of many of our land titles, that will not be lost upon the reader. William Penn, Lord Baltimore and Pocahontas are personages who appear in this delightful fantasy.

The arrangement and versification are admirable. The latter has a rhythmic movement and quality not unworthy of Gilbert himself.

It seems to us that it would form a delightful entertainment at Single Tax gatherings for the benefit of strangers on whom its phi-

losophy is not likely to fall unheeded. It has been presented at Arden with good success. You will like it. A very clever piece of work.

J. D. M.

## Correspondence

### WHERE THEY ARE DOING THINGS— NOT MERELY TALKING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

We have carried on a very active campaign here this winter and are having wonderful success in arousing interest. We are putting up a member of the group on a straight Single Tax ticket. We have mixed with the other parties in the past and got nowhere. We are now opposing them and right here in this neck of the woods we are quite a factor.

We have little hope of winning the seat at Edmonton for which we are contending, but the present time is wonderful for educational purposes. We get very fair treatment from the newspapers and the public and they seem very anxious to hear our message.

Milk River, Alberta.

FRED PEASE.

### MR. NEWTON D. BAKER IS WRONG

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Referring to the letter signed Robert S. Doubleday, page 69, March-April, 1935, LAND AND FREEDOM, I quote the last paragraph:

"Newton D. Baker tells me the administration cannot constitutionally do anything that he knows of looking toward the collection of economic rent."

In this connection I quote from a pamphlet published by Tecumseh Hall, Realty Building, Youngstown, O., last page:

"But legal and constitutional restrictions make this plan impossible!"

Just the opposite is true as is shown by two facts which every lawyer knows: (1) Blackstone wrote, ". . . there is no foundation in law why a set of words on parchment would convey dominion of land;" and (2) the dictum of our United States Supreme Court which paves the way for us in a decision written by Justice Freestone Miller, which includes this plain statement, "The reserved right of the people to take the full annual value of the land must be considered a condition to every deed."

The above mentioned pamphlet is "We Accept the Challenge," an open letter to Mr. Farley, by Peter Longbottom. Price 10 cents. Melrose, Mass.

A. RUST.

### A LETTER OF REAL CLARITY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your March-April, 1935, issue, C. H. Nightingale of New Zealand spends two columns showing that under free conditions our old friend "Interest" must "die a natural death." Then in six lines he tersely states the economic truth about interest:

"This is not to say that interest, in the sense of the added production which the use of capital gives, would be eliminated, but merely that the added production would go to labor as wages, instead of to idlers as interest. Interest in its economic sense must persist and grow with the advance of science, invention, organization, etc., that is not in question; . . ."

And this is a definition of economic interest, which is the only kind of interest there is. It is a subdivision of wages in the broad sense.<sup>1</sup> Capital can be used only by being consumed.<sup>2</sup> Its use is but a mode of labor.<sup>3</sup> The rate of interest is determined by the proportion or ratio between the amount of labor spent in making a tool and the amount of labor spent in using up the tool in production. The same rate of wages must apply to both. If wages rise, interest will rise. If wages fall, interest will fall in proportion.<sup>4</sup> Borrowing has no

relation to interest. It is earned at the same rate whether made by the user or borrowed from another.

What combatants on the interest question lack is uniformity of definition. "Make for thyself a definition," says Marcus Aurelius. Having made your definition stick to it, says Henry George.<sup>5</sup> We would then omit confusing capital with wealth and money with either. There is no such thing as "money interest" or "imperishable" money.

Money is neither land nor wealth, nor is it labor or capital. It earns nothing. Wealth in consumption or set aside (saved) for further consumption earns no interest. Idle capital earns no interest. Only capital that is actually consumed by labor in producing more goods for consumption earns interest and then in direct proportion to the labor spent in consuming it.

Many exactions loosely termed "interest" which are the fruit of monopoly, will indeed disappear with the abolition of monopoly. Usury or distress interest, so called, will tend to disappear, not because capital loaned is not entitled to interest, but because distress will disappear.

Mortgage interest on homes will tend to disappear, because a house used for a home is a labor product in consumption. It is used up in consumption and not in production of other goods as is a factory. It is only a larger overcoat that lasts thirty years instead of three years. Families will customarily own their homes without mortgage.

Interest on public debt will tend to disappear, because public debt will disappear. Public expenditures are mainly for immediate consumption to be paid for out of annual collections. "Debt service," now an ever increasing item, will disappear from the city budget.

With no field for investment except in products of labor, which are quickly perishable if not used, we will produce only to consume. We will "save" only so much as we find that it pays to do so in order to produce goods more easily for consumption to satisfy our desires—which we will always seek to do with the least possible effort.

N. Y. City.

WALTER FAIRCHILD.

### LESSONS FROM HISTORY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is encouraging to note that many of our scholastic economists are coming out solidly against the sales tax. Without a doubt, this tax is one of the most pernicious forms of taxation, for the whole burden of the sales tax is shifted to the ultimate consumers, the majority of whom constitute the poor working classes.

But most significant of all is the history of the sales tax, which was always seized upon by decadent nations as a last resort, as the following examples will show.

Gibbon (in "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," Milman edition, Vol. 1, Chap. 6, page 159) relates that

"In the reign of Augustus and his successors, duties were imposed on every kind of merchandise, which through a thousand channels flowed to the great center of opulence and luxury; and in whatever manner the law was expressed, it was the Roman purchaser and not the provincial merchant who paid the tax. . . ."

"The excise introduced by Augustus after the civil wars was extremely moderate, but it was general. It seldom exceeded one per cent; but it comprehended whatever was sold in the markets or at public auction from the most considerable purchases of lands and houses, to those minute objects which can only derive a value from their infinite multitude and daily consumption. Such a tax, as it affects the body of the people, has ever been the occasion of clamor and discontent."

Or, take the case of Spain, which suffered such a commercial shock from the "alcabalas" or excise taxes that it has not yet recovered

from them. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica (Eleventh Edition, Vol. XXI, page 549).

"The great source of the treasury was the 'alcabalas' or excises—taxes of from 5 to 10 per cent on an article every time it was sold—on the axe when it was sold to the butcher, on the hide when sold to the tanner, on the dressed hide sold to the shoemaker and on his shoes. All this did not bear its full fruit till later times, but by the seventeenth century it had made Spain one of the two most beggarly nations in Europe—the other being Portugal." See also Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," page 718.

To use another example, take the famous Corn Laws of the reign of Edward III, enacted in the year 1360. These duties or taxes inflated the price of bread so high that they were very burdensome to the people, especially the poor. A crude poet, known as the "Corn-Law Rhymers," described the incidence of this bread tax as follows:

"England! What for mine and me,  
What hath bread tax done for thee?  
Cursed thy harvest, cursed thy land,  
Hunger-stung thy skill'd right hand."

So unpopular did these Corn Laws become that Sir Robert Peel was forced, in 1846, to repeal them.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JOHN C. ROSE.

### A FEDERAL LAND VALUE TAX PERMISSABLE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In reply to yours, "A Bill is Pending in Congress" and to the query of Robert S. Doubleday, Tacoma, Wash., I submit the following:

The late Jonas Miles of Brookline, Mass., lawyer, music publisher and confirmed and able Georgist, argued that George's proposal could be put into effect practically at any time in Massachusetts or by the Federal Government, by means of an excise tax upon the privilege of privately appropriating ground rent. Of course, if such tax amounted to the whole ground rent and all other taxes were abolished, Henry George's proposal would be practically in full effect. Miles said, and I never heard any one dispute it, that under numerous decisions of the Massachusetts Supreme Court as well as by the Federal Supreme Court, the State and Federal Governments were empowered under their respective Constitutions to levy an excise tax on a privilege; also, argued Miles, unless said courts were prepared to deny the authority of Blackstone, Coke and Littleton, as well as reverse themselves, they would have to declare that the private appropriation of ground rent was a privilege.

I understand that Jackson H. Ralston holds the same opinion.

I am not a lawyer, but the argument sounds reasonable to me.

Chestnut Hill, Mass.

EDMUND J. BURKE.

### WHAT MR. LOOMIS BELIEVES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your Jan.-Feb. number appeared a letter from me in which I suggested the possibility, and in my opinion the probability, of lands having a selling value under the Single Tax. I quoted "Progress and Poverty" to show that Henry George recognized that this was at least a possibility. In your following issue Mr. Luxton took the position that any payment that might be made for land would not be a real selling value computed by capitalizing the economic rent. Mr. Luxton assumes that the Single Tax is to take 100 per cent of the economic rent. My contention is that the Single Tax as presented by Henry George does not necessarily involve taking the full 100 per cent.

To the quotation in my previous letter let me add the following ("Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II, near the middle): "By leaving to landowners a percentage of rent which would probably be much less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through State agency, we may, without jar or shock, assert the common right to land by taking rent for public uses."

Perhaps an illustration will make my meaning clear. I shall take

1. "Progress and Poverty," p. 203.  
2. Ibid., p. 198.  
3. Ibid., p. 198.  
4. "Progress and Poverty," p. 199.  
5. Ibid., p. 31.



an actual case, the purchase of my home. I shall then make some suppositions. To prevent anyone from building too close to the south of my house, I bought an extra lot. I paid exactly \$1,000 for it. At that time the taxes on the lot were about \$20 a year. On a five per cent basis the full economic rent of that lot was \$70 a year, of which \$50 went to the landowner and \$20 to the community. Let us now suppose that other things remain the same, but that the tax on the land is changed, let us say by changing the rates on improvements, etc. The following table gives the value of the lot on a five per cent basis for different rates of taxation.

Tax	Amount of Rent to Landowner	Value of Land
\$70.00	\$70.00	\$1,400
20.00	50.00	1,000
40.00	30.00	600
50.00	20.00	400
60.00	10.00	200
65.00	5.00	100
67.50	2.50	50
70.00	0	0

Even under the full Single Tax I personally believe the selling value of land will always be somewhat greater than a year's tax. In that case, if the tax is unpaid, forfeiture to the State pays the tax.

I come squarely to the position that the Single Tax does not of necessity involve taking 100 per cent of economic rent in taxation. I have now given a second quotation from "Progress and Poverty" to show that Henry George recognized that this was at least a possibility. It is certainly quite likely to be the result, if progress toward the Single Tax is, as I hope, by way of evolution.  
Chicago, Ill. HIRAM B. LOOMIS.

MR. LUXTON REPLIES TO MR. NIGHTINGALE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. C. H. Nightingale of New Zealand seems to be in doubt as to the meaning of the term interest. This confusion in his mind is revealed by the fact that he agrees most decidedly with my defense of interest as a return for wealth placed at the disposal of the borrower, and then suspects that I do not know that a lender may receive a return without receiving any interest. His demonstration suggests that we think in terms of wealth instead of money. All true economists, and that includes Single Taxers who have the necessary qualifications, think of money as a tool of industry, therefore they do not think of interest as money except in its reference to the amount of wealth it represents.

The demonstration of the twenty suits is no demonstration at all, and therefore worthless. Have we Single Taxers so little imagination that we must pattern our illustrations after the puerile arithmetical problems offered to little people not so long ago? At least the old time problems had one object, to teach rapid calculation work with numbers, and as such they succeeded. They could lay no claim to teaching anything else. Would a man make twenty suits for himself except to wear or to sell? And if he needed but one suit a year, to make nineteen extra would be idiotic unless he were a manufacturer of men's clothing. In that case would he be asinine enough to permit another to borrow nineteen suits with no other payment but a new suit for every year for nineteen years? The idea is preposterous and proves nothing.

But Mr. Nightingale has put his finger upon a sore spot when he questions the right of any man, his heirs, and assigns, to "sit down" and draw interest on his capital, ad infinitum. Let us look this question squarely in the face, because it is what lurks beneath the cranium of every Socialist when he demands that capital be taken over by the State for the workers and when he says that exploitation will still be possible when the State collects the economic rent of land. Let us approach this question by first defining interest.

According to nearly all economists interest is the share of the product that goes to capital for its aid to labor in the production of wealth. Any equitable distribution computation of the share of the product directly due to capital is impossible to make in general, though it might be possible in a few isolated cases. Henry George recognized this when he said that it would be foolish to say that the weapon-maker of the tribe should receive as his share all of the buffaloes killed by the use of his bows and arrows in excess of what the hunters could kill with stones or knives. He then showed that a man would expect the same net return for the use of his wealth that he would receive through the natural increase of the same amount of wealth in the form of herds or flocks, or bees, or of aging wine. This is a just way of computing interest at the present time, and it is simple enough to easily understand.

We must not overlook certain facts, however, the more so because the method of arriving at true interest in accordance with George's method is merely expedient. A man in a primitive state becomes expert in catching fish with his hands. The fish are his wages. If he catches six fish a day his wages are six fish. If he uses a canoe and a net and catches sixty fish, are fifty-four fish the interest that should go to the canoe and the net, or to the owner of these forms of capital? By no means! With bare hands the fisherman's wages are six fish because that is all his labor can net him. But his skill is limited to hands and feet in that case. With the use of a canoe and net he is forced to acquire a new technique, a new skill, a new means of utilizing his agility of muscle and quickness of eye to greater advantage. This new technique manifests itself in a greater catch of fish. His exertions are perhaps no greater, perhaps less, yet his production is greater many fold than in the cruder use of muscle and eye. This new technique is developed as an educational attribute of labor, and because of it labor is now more productive. If a co-efficient could be easily found for the aid rendered by the canoe and net we could compute his exact wages. Certain it is that the canoe or the net without the application of his skill and labor could produce nothing, as it is also certain that without canoe or net he could produce but six fish for a day's labor.

This is true of any tool or machine, or of any aid rendered by capital in any form. Without it labor must exert itself in crude and wasteful methods, and without labor capital can produce nothing, not even if it consists of those forms of wealth susceptible of a natural increase. Herds must be watched and guarded against beasts of prey and disease, bees must be cared for, wine must first be pressed out and then bottled, and finally labor must be exerted before the natural increase can be called wealth. It is also true that capital enables labor to exert itself in more productive ways. When the capital belongs to the laborer the laborer gets the entire return in a primitive state where no rent exists. If it is the property of another it represents labor spent or wealth given in exchange. If a man can borrow it without making a return for its use he will not bother to make a tool or weapon or other form of capital for himself. By taking advantage of the exertion of the labor of another he is able to produce in excess of the product of his labor unassisted by capital, but since part of this excess is due to the application of his skill in more productive measure the question of what share the capital had in his product would be hard to determine, certainly impossible for a primitive man. But the important thing is that he would be benefiting to that extent so that he would be getting nothing. The owner of the capital would be getting nothing for something, and here would be an inequitable distribution of wealth. He would soon stop lending his capital and this would lead to under-production because primitive, crude, and wasteful methods would have to be resorted to. To assure a supply of capital to enable labor to exert itself most productively a return must be made to encourage the owner of capital to keep lending it. In a primitive state this capital should be tools or weapons or canoes. The return would be based upon supply and demand, since no rent entered into the problem. If the boat maker demanded too great a

return it might pay the fisherman to make his own canoe. Thus payment or interest would be made to suit both borrower and lender. There would be no foolish arrangement such as a promise to pay so much in fish and to return a canoe as good as the one borrowed, but the payment would be in the product of the labor or its equivalent. Primitive men, being more wise than civilized men, instead of promising to return a good canoe in place of the old one after a season or two, the savage would set to work and make a canoe in the first place, and the canoe maker would have too much respect for the intelligence of his borrower to exact such a promise. Naturally such capital would wear out. There would be no such thing as collecting interest ad infinitum. Mankind would eat in the sweat of its brow.

With monopoly of natural resources, such as private ownership of land, and the advent of economic rent because of man's increase and development, the attendant inequitable distribution of wealth has placed large aggregations of capital in a few hands. In many cases this means the power to claim a large share of the produced wealth by reason of the ownership of a necessary factor in production, land, and this without the exertion of any productive labor by the owner. This leads to land speculation, the withholding of land from production. Capital then demands a return greater than it can get from land rent and so we have a false interest, a monopoly or holdup charge. Such interest is not predicated upon the assistance it gives to labor, nor upon the natural increase to wealth in the forms of flocks and herds. It follows the law of supply and demand all right, rising and falling as wages rise and fall, falling as rent rises, and rising as rent falls. Such interest contains a payment for risk. Such interest we are suffering now. Such interest is in Mr. Nightingale's mind when he speaks of payment ad infinitum.

If we stick to the definition of interest that all true Single Taxers should believe in, that interest is the return for the use of capital used in production, the share of capital in the wealth produced, we shall see that the restoring or renewing of capital does not enter into the question at all. Capital must follow the inevitable law of all nature and disintegrate. I know not why the idea of restoration of capital has crept into the idea of interest. It is illogical. Labor is the father of capital. As the individual who exerts the labor must disintegrate according to the law of life, being less and less able to exert labor as time progresses, until labor ceases with life, so must capital in the form of tools, buildings, clothing, also disintegrate, and be continually replaced by fresh applications of labor and capital. Get away from the fallacious doctrine that interest is to restore capital used up. Stick to the definition as given by Henry George.

Henry George has set us an example to follow in determining interest, the natural increase attendant upon wealth in forms capable of natural increase. But it is at best only an expedient. The labor is also a factor in what we assume to be a natural increase. A natural increase in herds unattended would be outweighed by the losses. Over a period of years herds and flocks would deteriorate, for our domestic herds and flocks, yes, our fruits and flowers, are the results of labor, mental and physical, in which nature's methods have been anticipated, the stock weakened physically for environmental struggles, and nature, ever jealous of trespassers in her domain, is continually causing a reversion to type. This natural increase is only an expedient in determining true interest but we have not progressed mathematically to the point where we can cast it aside. It is the only true way at present to judge interest, that is true interest.

That being the case let us now consider Mr. Nightingale's complaint. For example; a railroad company issues bonds bearing interest at four per cent to purchase equipment such as rolling stock and rails. Mr. Banker and Broker buys thousand dollar bonds for his children. The bonds mature in thirty years. In five years the rails are worn out, in ten years the locomotive and coaches discarded for more modern ones, but the bonds still go on paying interest, even long after the rails are rust and the cars junk. At the end of thirty years the bonds are redeemed and more bonds bought with the money.

The same thing goes on, the heirs and assignees collecting ad infinitum, long after the original capital has disintegrated.

We can see very easily that what appears to be interest here is not interest at all, not true interest. It is a collection of tribute for no service at all after the disintegration of the rails and rolling stock. It is a cancer, sucking the life blood from production. Interest ceased when capital disappeared. Converting the capital into money did not alter it. Under the regulation of the natural increase due to nature working through wealth in such forms as flocks, etc., we would have the owner of the capital, as evidenced by the bonds, paying for all repairs and replacements of the capital in rails and cars. Is this done? It is not. Until it is done we can not blame interest, true interest. And when it is done there will be nothing to blame interest for.

Mr. Nightingale is deserving of a vote of thanks for bringing up this question. Wrong though he may be, it is an honest mistake, a mistake due to our acceptance of the use of terms where they do not apply. If the owner of capital does not pay for the replacement or restoration of the capital, as I suggested, since in nature the form of wealth does this, but locomotives, cars, and rails can not reproduce, then the capital should be reappraised each year in conformance with its depreciation. This would wipe out the capital in a few years, as should indeed be done. It is done where a man owns his own capital in the form of carpenter's tools or a motor truck. Big business should be made to conform to the standards of justice found in every small cobbler's shop or printery.

The possibilities of this are enormous. We won't go to war to collect unpaid debts, and we won't pay for wars contracted by previous generations. A large idle class will be eliminated for the good of mankind. The payment of tribute on monopoly will stop, and the so-called payment of interest ad infinitum will be ended; that is, provided we adopt the Single Tax also. Otherwise we shall simply pay higher rents to the landowners ad infinitum.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

## ACTIVITY IN DENVER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your exposure of the puerility and stupidity of so-called statesmen and sham pretenders to economics is delightful.

I am glad to report that our local Georgists are becoming much more active. They meet every two weeks and are steadily making converts. Letters to the newspapers appear more frequently and there seems to be a more favorable attitude on the part of the editors. Despite the activity and the well directed opposition on the part of our friends in the legislature the Governor succeeded in having the sales tax put over under the guise of an emergency measure for relief. The unfavorable reaction against it is very strong and we are availing ourselves of the opportunity thus created to do some excellent propaganda work. People that never heard of Henry George before are learning about him now. The most encouraging sign is the number of young folks who are becoming interested. Our public forum meetings every Sunday afternoon are well attended.

In the agitation over the sales tax the attempt to couple the farmer and the realtor was especially noticeable. This gave us a good chance to point out that their relation to land has nothing in common. The farmer uses land to raise crops. To him high priced land is a handicap, just as is high priced materials and tools of any kind. Nor is the legitimate land dealer interested in high priced land. He can, indeed, find more purchasers and more tenants with cheap than with dear land.

It is the speculator alone who wants the price of land to rise. His profit comes from buying land at a low price and selling at a high price. The land speculator, and he alone, is interested in seeing the price of land advance.

The shoemaker does not want high priced leather, nor the baker, high priced flour. Why, then, should the farmer or the city land

user wish high priced land? It is only as a land speculator that a farmer could profit from the rising price of land, and then only after he had ceased to be a farmer. Tenants seeking to become owners are only tantalized by rising prices of land.

The working farmer is today taxed nearly to death. All that he buys, his tools, machinery, clothing, furniture, processed food, etc., is taxed in the hands of the producers, and again in the hands of the dealers. All these taxes are added to the price the farmer pays. They are taxed again yearly while in his possession. On top of it all, the farmer pays a tax based on the fictitious speculative value of his land.

If it be asked why the farmer does not recoup himself by adding his taxes to the price of his products, after the manner of the manufacturer and the merchant, it may be answered that his perishable crops must be sold at once, and the non-perishable have their prices fixed in the world market.

The sales tax abomination will not be an unmixed curse if we seize upon the opportunity it affords to educate the public on the evils of excise taxes. Already we may observe the pendulum beginning to swing the other way.

With best wishes for LAND AND FREEDOM and not forgetting its editor who serves us so efficiently,

Denver, Colo.

J. B. MCGAURAN.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE Brotherhood of the Commonwealth, an organization founded by Charles Frederic Adams, one of the closest friends of Henry George, is now in a fairly flourishing condition and certainly on a firm foundation. It includes a tontine form of old age insurance. The plan will interest Single Taxers and many Henry George men throughout the world are members of the Brotherhood. Many of its officers and directors are well and favorably known to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM. Oscar H. Geiger and Hon. Edward Polak are among the past presidents. After a trying time the organization is forging ahead. Literature explaining its aims and policies will be sent on application to this office.

OUR Roumanian correspondent, Ing. C. Barsony, reports that every week brings a new series of restrictions and interdictions for the benefit of a favored few. The evil consequences of laws interfering with trade and commerce are tending to the complete breakdown of Roumanian economic life. His letter ends with a statement that he may soon have news of the establishment of an enclave of economic rent in Roumania.

THE death of Mrs. August Lewis of this city, widow of August Lewis, occurred early in April of this year. She had reached an advanced age and was a sister of Dr. Walter Mendelson, formerly of this city, now of Philadelphia. August Lewis, whom many of the older readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will recall, was a devoted friend of Henry George and to him the "Science of Political Economy" is dedicated.

THE death of K. P. Alexander at Little Rock, Ark., on March 31, marks the passing of one of the veteran Single Taxers of the South, long a friend and contributor to LAND AND FREEDOM. He passed away quietly and easily. His sister was the only relative at the funeral, his son being in Japan. As nearly as we know he was in the seventies. P. W. Schwander of Houston, Texas, writes feelingly of his death and says, "Another faithful crusader gone to join the regiment of which we too shall be members in a few years—we who knew Henry George in the flesh and have labored long in the Master's vineyard to unveil the truth he tried to make clear."

A DINNER was held at the Town Hall in April in honor of Mayor McNair of Pittsburgh at which one hundred diners sat down. Charles

H. Ingersoll presided and introduced Charles S. Prizer, who told something of the personal history of the mayor. Among those who spoke briefly were Walter Fairchild, Theodore H. Miller, John Luxton, Grace Isabel Colbron, Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Charlotte O. Schetter, Harry Weinberger and others. Mayor McNair related what was transpiring in Pittsburgh with his keen sense of humor, and was vastly interesting. In more serious vein he contrasted the taxation prevailing in New York with that of Pittsburgh and commented on the attempts of the Pennsylvania legislature to oust the present administration in Pittsburgh. It was voted a very successful dinner and it was good to observe many out-of-towners

ONE of the bright young men who came from Japan to America some fifty years ago to study used to say that one of our universities was the best because the students got nothing from the professors.

THE *Lethbridge Herald* of Alberta, Canada, contains a report prominently featured of the opening rally of the Milk River Single Taxers for the campaign in the next provincial elections. The *Herald* speaks of it as "the most largely attended political meeting held in this district for many years." Among the speakers were H. C. Moir, George H. Tomfohr, Fred Pease, and S. A. Hulme. These speakers explained the operation of the Henry George system in Milk River. Mr. O'Hara acted as chairman. We who have met the members of this extraordinary group at both Henry George Congresses in Chicago know these boys who are stepping out to capture the province of Alberta. Their success would mean much to the movement in Western Canada.

DALE COX, columnist of the *Cleveland Plaindealer*, took occasion to rebuke our friends E. W. Doty and Peter Witt for their support of Roosevelt and the New Deal (see March-April LAND AND FREEDOM, page 63). Mr. Doty who is a good sport writes Mr. Cox as follows:

"Your column this morning was great, and on the face of it is substantially correct—seemingly so substantial and seemingly so correct that I am not going to take the trouble to deny nuthin'.

"I did have hope that Washington would accomplish something real, but my hope has been dashed. Just when the dashing was accomplished I am not sure, but at least before your column appeared. As proof of this I enclose copy of a letter I wrote Henry Busch yesterday morning in a fit of agony over the state of the nation.

"But your castigation serves us—Pete and me—right. We really knew better all the time but didn't work at it as we should have, and as you point out."

N. D. ALPER has prepared an interesting Questionnaire which appears in the *St. Louis Times Star*, and answers are requested. The column has aroused a good deal of attention. Mr. Alper is one of the most active Single Taxers in St. Louis.

MR. CHARLES G. MERRELL of 67 Reilly Road, Wyoming, O., is in need of the following issues of LAND AND FREEDOM to complete his files: Sept.-Oct., 1931; July-Aug., 1932; and March-April, 1932, Maybe some of our readers can supply these needs.

THE "Soviet Table" is a pamphlet containing a radio broadcast by John L. Raper, well-known columnist of the *Cleveland Press* and friend of the Single Taxers of that city. Most of the allusions are of local interest. Newton D. Baker comes in for some stinging rebukes.

JOSEPH R. Carroll of Norfolk, Conn., writes: "I have just finished March-April LAND AND FREEDOM and cannot refrain from an expression of delight that we Single Taxers are so fortunate as to have such a publication. Certainly there is no other publication in the country which combines depth and brilliance as these qualities are combined in your Comment and Reflection." In John Lawrence Monroe's report in March-April number Mr. Carroll's home town is given as Norfolk, Va. It should be Connecticut. His class of three given in that report has now grown to six.

REPRESENTATIVE E. M. VON SEGGERN of the Nebraska legislature, editor and publisher of the *West Point Republican* and one of the directors of the Henry George League of Nebraska, has succeeded in successfully routing the sales tax proponents. Mr. A. W. Falvey of Omaha considers this victory all the more remarkable since the real estate interests back of the bill were intent on shifting taxation in this session.

THERE is other good news from Omaha. Mr. W. F. Baxter, long a friend of LAND AND FREEDOM, is happily recovered from a very serious illness and is momentarily expected back at his desk in the store over which he has presided for many years.

MAYOR McNAIR of Pittsburgh is reported in the *New York World-Telegram* to have said that lady Astor's income from New York real estate was one hundred thousand daily. "Imagine it," said Mr. McNair. "And what happens? When that money from New York arrives in England the English government takes half of it. New York, which has produced the social services and protection which made Lady Astor's land so valuable, gets nothing."

Two irritating typographical errors crept into the printing of Raymond V. McNally's article "The Gold Clause Muddle" in March-April LAND AND FREEDOM. On page 58, first column, second paragraph, the text reads "While it does not have an intrinsic value greater than that of any paper currency," the "not" should be dropped. On page 59, second column, second paragraph the text reads, "While it would not appear that the minority judges were more logical in ruling that the joint resolution was invalid," again as in the first instance the "not" should be eliminated.

THE following resolution introduced by H. W. Noren was unanimously approved by the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh:

We protest against the humiliating spectacle of the Governor of Pennsylvania going with hat in hand to Washington begging for hand outs.

Pennsylvania, which is the richest State in the Union in natural resources, can support in comfort four times its present population and it should be the State Government's first concern to see that the people have access to these resources.

The Federal Government has no tax income save the wealth it confiscates from workingmen, industry and thrift. We resent our Governor's action, and respectfully request that he ask no more loans or hand-outs from the Federal Robin Hood.

MRS. TERESSE BURGER writes us: "It has been interesting indeed in my correspondence to discover how many believe in the doctrine of Henry George. A few weeks ago in answer to a letter, Rabbi Samuel J. Levison of Temple Beth Emeth of Flatbush, Brooklyn, the largest reform congregation in that section and having the largest Men's Club in the United States, wrote me as follows: "I have not only read but preached Henry George. I have always been interested in his Moses and have discussed it from my pulpit." Dr. Levinson is one of the most prominent rabbis in American Jewry.

WILL RYAN of Staten Island, N. Y., writes us: "If you will consult the third and fourth words at the top of page 425 of "Progress and Poverty" (Doubleday-Page edition) you will see that Henry George uses the expression Single Tax on the value of land. If you want an up-to-the-minute quotation for LAND AND FREEDOM begin with the first paragraph on page 425 and print the balance of the chapter. People will think it was written today until you cite the quotation."

DURING April Benjamin W. Burger of New York City, under the auspices of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, addressed various College classes on "Economic Fundamentals." Among them were three

classes of Prof. Broadus Mitchell at the John's Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., one class at Georgetown University, Georgetown, Md., and four classes at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va. Mr. Burger is anxious that the connections established by the late James R. Brown shall not be lost.

WILL our readers remember that one of the conditions confronting the Henry George School at the end of three years when the Board of Education renews the charter of the School for the ensuing five years, is that the School should have accumulated a library of five thousand books. The number of books is still far short of the required five thousand, though it has made a very respectable beginning. If any of our readers can donate books to the School library they will be gratefully received. In all cases the name of the donor is inscribed on the fly leaf of every book. It is not necessary that these books shall be economic in character. Any books of a cultural nature will be appropriate. The new librarian of the School is Charles Erwood who can be addressed care of the Henry George School.

MRS. OSCAR H. GEIGER, wife of the beloved founder of the Henry George School, will visit New York this summer with her son, Dr. George Raymond Geiger, author of "The Philosophy of Henry George." Dr. Geiger will visit Spain and France some time during the summer.

A DINNER under the auspices of the Manhattan Single Tax Club of this city to welcome Judge Jackson H. Ralston of California, was held at Roberts Gardens in Greenwich Village section on May 9. There were sixty in attendance and among those present were Mr. and Mrs. Pitt. Mr. Pitt is librarian of the Melbourne Public Library and Vice President of the Henry George League of Melbourne. Mr. Walter Fairchild acted as toastmaster and limited the speakers to one minute. We nominate Mr. Fairchild for permanent chairman of all Single Tax meetings. The editor of LAND AND FREEDOM was allowed a longer time for he had been selected to tell the diners—the few who did not know—who Judge Ralston was. The latter's career as an untiring advocate of our cause was reviewed in some detail. The one minute speeches were made by Chas. S. Prizer, Frank Stephens, Chas. H. Ingersoll, Stephen Bell and others. Judge Ralston made an earnest plea for the use of the initiative and referendum to put over our principles. He said we had neglected our most important tool and spoke with some optimism of the outcome of the campaign for the California amendment. It was an impressive plea and those present left with the feeling that the fight in Judge Ralston's state was in excellent hands.

GEORGE E. EVANS, President of the Henry George Foundation, who recently resigned as Superintendent of the Bureau of Building Inspection, was elected a member of the Pittsburgh City Council on April 17 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Councilman William J. Soost, a Republican member elected in 1931. Mr. Evans had been duly nominated by the Democratic voters of Pittsburgh in the primary election in September, 1933, but withdrew from the ticket in favor of former Mayor William A. Magee, who was elected at the ensuing November election, together with the full Democratic municipal ticket, headed by Hon. William N. McNair. In all probability Mr. Evans will be a candidate at the fall election for the full term of four years in City Council. The choice of Mr. Evans to fill the vacancy gives Pittsburgh two active Single Taxers in its Council of nine members (the other member being Hon. Walter R. Demler).

IN Newark, N. J., the Teachers Association held a meeting at the Central High School, Miss Lucile O'Shea presiding. There were speeches on the sales tax and the income tax. James G. Blauvelt, President of the Henry George League of New Jersey, spoke in advocacy of the Single Tax. At the close there were answers to ques-

tions directed at the speakers and Mr. Blauvelt answered a number of these. There was an attendance of 250.

A MEETING of those interested in taxation was held at Clifton, N. J., early in May at which Stephen Bell presided and Chas. H. Ingersoll and James G. Blauvelt spoke. There were eighty present.

WALDO J. WERNICKE of Los Angeles, Calif., is enthusiastic over the Henry George School. He writes: "It must be sustained and multiplied in every State and Nation." He tells of an interesting bit of news which is that a book by R. O. Hughes, entitled "The New Community Civics," contains a reference to Henry George and the Single Tax as a proposed remedy for the present day problems and that a twelve year old girl is using this book in her home studies as per instruction of the local Catholic directors.

On May 3 Morris Van Veen delivered a vastly interesting address at the Henry George School in Brooklyn conducted by John Luxton and gave a number of illuminating stories illustrating the evils of our present land tenure in the City of New York. Most of these stories were a revelation to his hearers and constituted a valuable lesson by examples.

GEORGE T. TIDEMAN of Chicago has sent a letter with a draft of a bill to every member of the Illinois legislature. He writes: "The Governor is trying to force through an increase in the sales tax and the solons are between the devil and the deep blue sea. . . . My respect and admiration for Henry George increases with study and experience and I am not to be counted among those who regard his name as a deterrent to our progress. Those who are prejudiced against the name of Henry George or the Single Tax would not be different were these names different. I wonder where the American Legion (of which I am a member) would find a more nearly one hundred per cent American than Henry George."

E. J. CRAIGIE of Adelaide, Australia, writes: "Things generally in Australia are in a bad way, mainly owing to our high tariff policy pressing with great severity upon our primary industries. The 70,000 farmers in Australia are in debt to the extent of £140,000,000 according to the report of the Royal Commission on the wheat industry. I read with interest the account of the movement in the States and desire to congratulate you on the work done."

MR. P. W. SCHWANDER comments on Dr. Townsend's pension plan (or any other plan in fact) as follows: "What is the use of paying pensions to get money in circulation if you must take money out of circulation to pay the pensions?"

AAGE MOLLER of Askov, Minn., writes us: "If there is any doubt in my mind regarding the Single Tax it is not known to me. I share my conversion with an old friend and neighbor. We read Single Tax literature together and we try to disseminate the teachings of Henry George."

THE death of Bolton Smith at Washington, D. C., in his seventy-third year occurred March 26. He was one of the group of active Single Taxers in Memphis until he took up his residence in Washington. He was born in Indianapolis, attended school in Dresden, Germany, and graduated from the Geneva University in 1878. He was also a graduate of the University of Virginia. He was greatly interested in the Boy Scout movement. In 1931 he was appointed by Nicholas Murray Butler as a member of the committee on economic sanctions to study methods of economic pressure which might be used as a deterrent against war. He was interested in the Brookings Institute. He was one of the Single Taxers from Memphis who attended the first Single Tax Congress in 1890. The other was B.

Gratz Brown. He is survived by a son, Carlisle Bolton Smith, and a sister in San Antonio, Texas. He was a friend of LAND AND FREEDOM and made for many years an annual contribution to its upkeep.

THE death of Donald Bradford of Seattle, Wash., occurred Feb. 3. Mr. Bradford was 74 years old. He was one of Seattle's old guard Georgists and at the age of 28 was mayor of Helena, Mont. Born a neighbor of Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Ill., he cherished a book autographed by Lincoln and given to his father by the martyred president. He leaves a widow and a son. C. Arlin Nave of Seattle, whose name will be familiar to some of our readers, is a convert of Mr. Bradford.

EDMUND J. BURKE of Chestnut Hill, Mass., has addressed a letter to President Roosevelt in which he puts several questions to the Chief Executive. One is: "Do you know that capitalism is not an economic system and that the only intelligent meaning of the word is a state of society that makes use of labor-saving machinery and tools for increasing the productivity of labor? Do you not know that rent is a value produced entirely by the presence and activities of the community and is therefore the only proper source of public revenue and should be wholly collected into the public treasury for public expenditures?"

EVARISTO MONTALVO writes us that it is almost certain that Dr. Carlos Portela, former secretary of the treasury of the Republic of Cuba under the Layas administration and prominent Georgist, will be named for the same office shortly. The present Cuban government has approved in great measure Dr. Portela's fiscal policy.

THE *Los Angeles Times* through its correspondent, Earle E. Crowe, gives an interesting account of Germany's experience in taxing vehicles six or seven per cent of the consumer's price of the car. On March 1, 1933, the tax was repealed and 40,000 unemployed workers went back to work. Mr. Crowe makes this comment: "The American government and its political subdivisions are in most instances following the opposite course. It will be interesting to see at least one experiment in the promotion of private initiative as opposed to slow death by punitive taxation."

DR. A. W. PLUMMER of Lisbon Falls, Me., writes: "It is a pity the term real estate cannot be gotten rid of somehow. The difference respecting taxation on land and taxation on improvements has been repeatedly called to the attention of economists and legislators without result." Which reminds us that Grace Isabel Colbron, idly scribbling on her menu card at a recent Henry George dinner, traced the following: "Separate assessment is the beginning of tax wisdom," and handed it to the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM. It should be inscribed in letters of gold.

IT is an inspiring report of activities that is issued by A. W. Madsen of London, editor of *Land and Liberty*. It reviews the work done since January of this year, numbers of books and pamphlets published and distributed, meetings addressed or arranged, and special advertising campaigns in progress. The number of out-going letters apart from circulars or form letters in that period was 1,540.

E. T. WESTRUP of Monterey, Mexico, has sent us a copy of a tract which he has had printed and which is entitled, "My Socialism." This tract is printed in Spanish. Mr. Westrup translated some time ago "The Story of My Dictatorship" into Spanish. Mr. Westrup lost his chair of English at the University of Monterey because of his refusal to subscribe to the so-called "Socialistic education" enforced in Mexico by the politicians. It may be possible for us to reprint some time in the future a translation of Mr. Westrup's pamphlet referred to above.



## CHAINED

**A** *New Illustrated Brochure* containing 30 halftone pictures and text matter, showing the increase of poverty with the increase of wealth.

Printed on a fine offset paper and sold to you at less than the printing cost. Buy as many as you can distribute to prospective students. Price 5c a copy.

PHONE OR MAIL YOUR ORDERS TO

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**

211 W. 79TH STREET, NEW YORK

Telephone: SUsquahanna 7-1167

IT'S EASY FOR YOU TO

# Start a Class

IN

## "Progress and Poverty"

### Later, Build a School

That's the sure-fire way to help. You learn your economics by studying this great book. Help others get the truth in the same way. Get some of your friends—three, six or a dozen—to agree to read regularly assigned portions of the book, and to meet once a week at your home or office to discuss what they have read. You can direct the discussion easily and properly with a

## Teacher's Manual

This valuable book was compiled by the late Oscar H. Geiger in his work of teaching "Progress and Poverty." It is the result of years of painstaking study—also of practical application to class room work. With this Manual—containing 263 questions and answers, suggestions on how to conduct discussions, regular reading assignments, illustrative charts—you can easily conduct your class through the eight lessons to a complete understanding of the message of Henry George. You will enjoy it and you will be doing something real in advancing the cause. Your friends will appreciate the knowledge.

## The Price--\$1.00

Organize your group—send for your Manual and start spreading the light **Now!**

As long as they last these Manuals will be supplied by the

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**

Extension Course Department

211 West 79th Street

New York

July—August, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

The Soldier---Then and Now

Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn

Frank Stephens Passes

The Coming Henry George Congress

Opinion Makers in Our Day

John Collins

Norman C. B. Fowles Examines Emil Jorgeson and  
Benjamin W. Burger Does the Same Service for Mr. Ogden

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 302 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

## JULY—AUGUST, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 4 WHOLE No. 191

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,  
Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	107
THE SOLDIER—THEN AND NOW .....Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn	109
FRANK STEPHENS PASSES.....	111
ON THE MARCH WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE ....	112
ACTIVITIES OF MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB ....	113
THE CALIFORNIA MOVEMENT.. Hon Jackson H. Ralston	114
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS TO MEET SEPT. 23-25....	115
HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT DINNER .....Margaret F. Bingham	116
OPINION MAKERS IN OUR DAY.....John Collins	119
MISCELLANY.....	121
BOOK REVIEWS ...Norman C. B. Fowles, Walter Fairchild, B. W. Burger	125
CORRESPONDENCE.....	131
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	135

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

Vol. XXXV

JULY—AUGUST, 1935

No. 4

## Comment and Reflection

**I**T is characteristic of current thinking that it deals with surface indications. One would scarcely imagine that all of these problems we call problems of distribution were existant prior to the invention of money and prior to the establishment of forms of government. When wealth is considered it is estimated in the form of money; when wages are spoken of the mind thinks of so many dollars a day, or so many shillings a week. And it goes no further than that.

**I**T is perhaps no exaggeration to say that half of our so-called economic works of the present decade deal with the subject of money, and hence the basic fundamental laws of political economy have been utterly lost in their reasoning and calculations. This has resulted in the world losing sight of much economic phenomena that is more important and entirely independent of money systems, stable money, the gold standard, bi-metalism, greenbackism, and all the host of related theories and fallacies covering the medium of exchange. In this welter of confusion, this Babel of tongues, the really significant things are rarely touched upon.

**A**LL the fundamental phenomena of distribution are prior to the invention of money and remain under all systems of coinage. Men work and produce, and are robbed of the fruits of their toil through tariffs and taxes, and the private collection of the rent of land. Thus the masses of men are kept in poverty because of institutions independent of all mediums of exchange, which while not unimportant are purely subsidiary and, measured fundamentally, largely negligible.

**I**F we keep in mind the true connotations respecting money, while realizing that faulty monetary systems do cause loss and inconvenience, we shall be nearer to the solution of all real economic problems. But so long as we imagine that these problems can be solved through approaches to money or changes in the monetary system (vide Father Coughlin) we are traveling *from* and not *toward* a real solution.

**B**UT there is one thing that is significant and reassuring. That is that the social ferment is now mount-

ing to the top. It is no longer confined to the members of the lower strata, the less influential groups, but the Church, and notably the Catholic Church, is showing signs of uneasiness. The phenomenon of Dr. Coughlin, despite his concern with the superficialities of the problem, as for example the question of money to which we have had occasion to refer, is not unpromising in the welter of confusion to which he has in some measure contributed. And this not merely because of his occasional hints at something more fundamental, but because here is a priest of the Church who for the first time in several decades speaks for the disinherited, and, doffing his priestly robes, appears in the character of an American citizen in a fearless assault against what he regards as economic abuses.

**J**UST how much of this has the friendly countenance of the Pope, just how much of it is due to example set by the Supreme Ruler of the Church, it is of course impossible to say. Let the reader's memory go back to Elizabeth Barrett Browning, who, disappointed at the failure of the then Supreme Pontiff to carry out the liberal professions of his earlier years, wrote these bitter lines:

"Perhaps it is that other eyes may see  
From Casa Guidi windows what is done  
Or undone; but whatsoever deed they be  
Pope Pius will be glorified in none."

**I**T may be said with confidence that it is doubtful if ever again another Elizabeth Barrett Browning will be able justly to voice such criticism. The present Pope appears in a very different light. A benignant presence rules at the Vatican. Despite the dignity of his great office, he is a lovable personality. A change has come over the Church, a very subtle but very noticeable change. The social ferment has risen. In high places now the economic and social structure of society is being subjected to searching questions. There is everywhere a suspicion that the foundations of society are unsound. From this inquiry nothing but good can come.

**W**E repeat that the phenomena of Dr. Coughlin and his Bishop are distinctly reassuring. Confident

as we are that the remedy proposed by Henry George is the true one we can afford to wait on the development of independent thinking among the clergy to straighten out the confused thinking which after all is not important if men, including churchmen, are free to think and express their thought. For there are other Father Coughlins to come. If we believe a change has arrived it will not be long before some great voice will be heard from the Church with a message that will ring round the globe.

**W**E have read with gratification the admirably reasoned defense of Father Coughlin from his Bishop, Michael Gallagher, and again we can afford to ignore the implications of the philosophy for the vastly more important declaration of the intellectual independence of the priesthood. Despite the influence that must have been brought to bear to close the lips of the priest, the Bishop gives him his imprimatur, which is "leave to print," in this case the leave to speak. He says: "It does not mean that the Bishop agrees with everything to which he has given his imprimatur." And again: "His judgments are necessarily personal judgments but they are absolutely essential to estimate the ratio of our nation's debt to our nation's wealth or to see a just rate of interest on mortgaged property."

**T**HE language is a little loose here. But again we can afford to ignore it for the fine sympathy exhibited throughout by His Excellency, and the courage with which he faces the question of the inequitable distribution of wealth. If he does not get close to the problem the important thing is that he recognizes it. In declaring for the freedom of Father Coughlin to circulate his written and spoken word "without objection throughout the land," His Excellency has ranged himself with the great leaders of the Church who, fearless and intrepid, have borne witness to the truth as they saw it. When he says: "Father Coughlin preaches the doctrine of *social justice for all*" we cannot doubt that he believes this and will stand by him when and if he does. What more can we ask? We repeat, the social ferment is rising.

**W**ALTER LIPPMAN is most impressive in his title heads. We are held in pleasurable anticipation of what we may look for in the subject matter—only in most cases to be disappointed. Maybe the *Herald-Tribune's* heading to his recent Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard is not his, but it is so close an imitation to his habitual title heads as to serve for an example. The heading is as follows: "Lippman Tells Youth to Hold Economic Liberty as Its Ideal." Looks promising for a moment, doesn't it?

**E**VER since Mr. Lippman as a young man started out with his friend Croly to write on economic and social questions he has been like that. He indicates fundamentals only to evade them a few paragraphs later—perhaps in the very same paragraph. He is very attractive, he is a master of English and apparent coherency. We listen entranced if we do not stop to ask inconvenient questions. In this address he talks of "economic liberty"—he uses the phrase at least—but it is quite clear that he does not know what it is. He has approved and condemned the experimentation and regulation that have gone on under the present administration. He was never quite certain where he stood.

**H**E has no full conception of what constitutes "economic liberty." Otherwise he would have swept away with one impressive condemnation the preposterous experiments of the Roosevelt Administration. He would have been able to see that one man at least, in an epoch-making work, had talked understandingly of "economic liberty." He would have gone to Henry George instead of ignoring him. The challenge that this unknown printer made to the world over fifty years ago is as vital now as it was in the time it was written, and it will remain vital until it is answered. Lippman is like so many of his cotemporaries that have gained the ear of a half cultured and superficially thinking public, so enamoured of their own wordy speculations and phrases that seem to mean something but slip away from the understanding like so many slippery snakes, that if they ever hit upon some fundamental principle, it is by the merest accident and is promptly forgotten.

**M**R. LIPPMAN says in this address at Harvard: "We are unable to transmit from our generation to the next a credible and coherent tradition." It is not so much a tradition that is needed as an understanding. Economic liberty is impossible without a place to work, and land is a place to work. We thank Brother Foley for that contribution to clear thinking. We commend it to Mr. Lippman. If he will prayerfully consider it he will write fewer words but he will write more sense.

**T**HE text book on physics used in Cincinnati high schools during the 1880's declared a heavier-than-air flying machine impossible because no engine powerful enough to lift the weight of a man could lift its own weight. Probably the same or similar textbooks were used in most other cities. We may laugh at this teaching now but it is no laughing matter, for it undoubtedly discouraged much research and effort that may have given us the airplane sooner and given us more time for progress in air navigation. Similarly fallacies taught today in universities as economics, which may be laughed at forty years hence, constitute no laughing matter.

## The Soldier—Then and Now\*

SPEECH IN TOLEDO, O., BY RABBI MICHAEL AARONSOHN,  
BEFORE THE 37TH DIVISION OF THE A. E. F. ASSOCIATION

SEVENTEEN years ago our national life was imperiled, and we did something about it. Thoroughly unprepared for modern warfare, nevertheless we brought the World War to a close by the most thrilling demonstration of dynamic idealism in the story of man.

Whatever others may say in deprecation of the part we played in that historic drama, none can take from us the passion of patriotism we enjoyed in those days, which tried every man's soul. Our detractors may scoff, but we were happy warriors. Seventeen years ago when we National Guardsmen of Ohio were mustered into the Federal service we looked upon ourselves as the chosen defenders of the nation—indeed, as the champions of the rights of the common people in every part of the world.

Now when you and I were formally inducted into the Federal service, we pledged ourselves to defend our country and our American Constitution. Such an oath taken under such stirring circumstances is as binding today as it was in August, 1917. A certificate of discharge and the payment of a bonus could not relieve us of the obligation to defend our country and to preserve our Constitution. We who witnessed the lives of our comrades snuffed out on the field of battle, we who are acquainted with the grief and the travail of our disabled comrades, cannot be discharged from active service either by the free-will offerings of grateful countrymen, or by the gratuities wrested from a ballot-conscious Congress. We can but hold all medals, all such flattering forms of tribute, in disdain. The love we have for our country cannot be bartered away. That flame of patriotism can be extinguished neither by ingratitude, nor by ridicule, nor by pensions. We were soldiers in 1917, we are soldiers today—ready again to defend our country and to preserve our American Constitution.

We recognize that eternal vigilance must be the watchword of every National Guardsman of our Republic. We know how dangerous it is to be lulled into innocuous passive-ism. We have innumerable foes that day and night work for our destruction. More than we realize

---

During the War Michael Aaronsohn served as Sergeant-Major, 147th Regiment, U. S. Infantry. Following the Armistice he became actively interested in veteran welfare. For six years he was National Chaplain of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War. At present he is chaplain, 37th Division, A. E. F. Association; president, 147th Regiment Association; chaplain of various veteran posts in Cincinnati. For eight years he was the National Field Representative of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. He is now engaged in the preparation of an autobiographic account of World War experiences.

He is a close friend of Mr. Abe D. Waldauer of Memphis, Tenn.

the foes we must be most wary of are those which in satanic strategy center their attacks upon the moral and spiritual unity of our countrymen. For our enemies know that so long as we have a virtuous population that will rise up and stand as a wall of steel around our Republic, we need have no fear of invasion. But in any event, when the national life is threatened, either by enemies from without or enemies from within, we National Guardsmen must not be silent, we must not compromise our patriotism; we must do something about it.

Confident of the unsurpassed will and power of my fellow-countrymen to triumph over every natural and human force that now tries the nation's spirit, I warn you not to look to Europe for a way out of our economic dilemma. We can, we will be victorious eventually if we patiently rely upon the honor, the good sense, and the virtues of our American prophets. We must not borrow patterns of government. All that we need today are men of courage and vision, men in whom there is the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln to show us the way to victory.

As I survey the childish practices of politicians, as I consider the collective irresponsibility and abject abdication of authority on the part of our legislators, as I weigh the words of clergymen and educators, as I examine the experiments of statesmen and industrialists, as I observe the enslavement of nearly thirty million of my countrymen to poverty and to the fear of poverty, as I study the supreme paradox of the ages—untold millions of unemployed, under-nourished, world-weary, crushed men, women, and children tramping the streets and highways of the cities and villages of this opulent Republic,—I marvel that this nation, so incomparably great in war, should appear so helpless in the solution of our political-economic imbroglio. Surely in this generation we are not lacking men of vision and courage and talent needed for this crisis! We were soldiers in the World War; we are soldiers today; our country and our Constitution are in danger. We must do something about it.

With the utmost respect for your intelligence and patriotism I am going to set before you this afternoon a plan of action no less American in spirit and content than the Declaration of Independence, the Federal Constitution, and the Gettysburg Address of Abraham Lincoln. The sure remedy that I shall prescribe for the salvation of our national life was conceived by an extraordinary American more than fifty years ago, and was dedicated to the proposition that all men are created by God for the full and noble enjoyment, according to each man's capacity and taste, of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The programme I shall advocate is not in the nature of political reformation. It has no conflict with the Constitution. Actually it calls for the fulfillment of the American dream of democracy. It provides for a minimum of public regulation, and for a

maximum of personal liberty and security. It is the Single Tax programme as divinely set forth by that illustrious American whom Prof. John Dewey ranks among the greatest of the great of all times—that American philanthropist and prophet, Henry George of blessed memory.

In essence the Single Tax programme of Henry George calls for a drastic revision and simplification of our system of taxation. With all my faith I affirm that had our statesmen in 1881 carried out the true principles of political economy as set forth by Henry George, panics, depressions, mass unemployment, and the general demoralization of industry and commerce would be as obsolete today as are the leech and the barber in the field of medicine, the astrologer and the alchemist in the field of science, and wizards and witches in the field of religion. We must confess that in the field of political economy we are just as backward today as were the Egyptians in the days of the pyramid-building Pharaohs. Foremost among the nations of the world in industry, commerce, invention, and in all the arts and sciences; advanced in religious and intellectual tolerance, we are nevertheless in our present system of taxation as benighted as were the Romans in the days of the Caesars. Our glorious ideal of democracy has been mischievously entangled by a Gordian knot of unnatural, unreasonable, and mutually destructive forms of taxation: forms of taxation that strike down brave and free men in their quest for honest employment, that rob labor and capital of their just rewards, that enchain the farmer, that crush the life out of industry and commerce, and that like vampire-bats suck the life-blood out of the nation.

Centuries ago the legends of the Orient foretold that whosoever loosed the Gordian knot would become the master of Asia. Alexander the Great cut the knot with the keen edge of his sword. We soldiers of a former day, we soldiers of today, can cut the Gordian knot that is now choking the life out of our nation if we will but dare to strike through with the keen edge of the sword of truth.

We can extirpate poverty, we can increase the wages of the workmen, we can secure the investment of the merchant and the manufacturer, we can provide decent employment for all our countrymen, we can root out crime and vice, we can diffuse wealth universally, we can do justice to the veteran, to the widow, to the orphan, to the infirm, and to all the forgotten men and women and children in every part of this wonderful country, we can insure the income and the independence of the farmer, we can effect sweeping reductions in the budgetary requirements of municipal, State and Federal departments of government, we can provide houses of learning for all our children, we can prevent political and moral disintegration, we can make gigantic strides towards social, industrial, and even world peace—if we will but obey the laws of nature and of God; if we will but heed

the voices of history and of science;—we can do all these things by applying the simple and sovereign remedy of the Single Tax programme of Henry George.

It is altogether fitting and significant that so righteous and yet so simple a plan of national and world recovery should thus be publicly advocated by an American soldier. For all the land we so proudly call our own, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from Canada to Mexico, together with Alaska, Hawaii, and all other possessions of this empire-republic—was for the most part won and secured by the valor, the sacrifices, and the perseverance of the American soldier.

It is important that we bear this fundamental principle in mind because the Single Tax of Henry George has its basis in the right to the use of all land, together with the payment of community-rent to the State in the form of a tax on the bare value of land only. There is to be no confiscation of land. There is to be no change in the method of sale or the use of land, and no monopoly, no calamitous speculation in land. Furthermore, instead of a multiplicity of altogether unjust and monstrous forms of tax-exploitation, we will have but a Single Tax on the site value of the land, which the courage and the will to sacrifice of the American soldier under the grace of God now make secure for the use and the blessing of all.

Soldiers of 1917; Soldiers of today; we have no selfish ends, no private interests to serve. That flame of patriotism still burns brightly in our souls, and we can feed that flame by the knowledge of the presence of kindred living spirits in every part of this country yearning and praying, as I do, from day to day for fresh opportunities, for creative and upbuilding service under the Stars and Stripes.

On this day of our reunion and of our rededication to the ideals and to the patterns of the master-builders of our Republic, I present the ethical and economic testament of Henry George as the American programme. It is for you, my comrades, to study, to know, and then to become the persuasive dauntless advocates of this simple and sound system of harmonious social life within the wise and immortal frame of the American Constitution. Hours thus spent in an earnest effort to bring about this reconstruction of our tottering political-economic foundations by freeing our countrymen from the tyranny of taxation,—without the sacrifice of life or limb—will speedily be rewarded by God with victory and peace, liberty, justice, and plenty for all the sons and daughters of America.

**A** proposed solution of an economic problem which includes depriving a wealth producer of part of his product deserves no consideration. Social justice can not be secured through legalized robbery. No one who advocates such a measure, however sincere, can be a safe economic guide.

## Frank Stephens Passes

THE death of Frank Stephens on June 16 takes from us one of the last surviving members of the Old Guard. A leader in the Delaware campaign, a member of the Dover Jail Club where a group of Single Taxers were arrested and imprisoned, one of the old time editors of *Justice*, prominent in the enclavial movement, active in the Committee of 48, present at nearly every one of the Henry George Congresses during successive years, and a devoted friend of Henry George whom he knew personally, his activities were co-extensive with the history of the movement for more than fifty years.

And in those years he was foremost in the war for social justice. A moving orator and personally lovable, he probably had a larger number of friends and admirers than any man in the movement. There were angles to his beliefs and convictions which were occasionally puzzling to his associates, but on the fundamentals he never wavered. He approached the great problem from the ethical angle, and he was a strong individualist and a stickler for freedom. He was, despite his questionings, a tower of strength to the movement for nearly six decades.

It was but a few weeks before his death that he dined on May 27 at the White House by invitation of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt whom he had met during her visit to Arden. There were present at this luncheon only a few but these included Mrs. Louis Howe and John Roosevelt. The subject discussed was homesteads and it is easy to imagine that Frank did not neglect the opportunity to present to the First Lady of the land the broader aspects of the question. Mrs. Roosevelt obtained first-hand information of the Single Tax enclaves where the principles of Henry George are to some extent recognized. Mr. Stephens told us before the occasion of this luncheon how much impressed he was by Mrs. Roosevelt's fine sympathies and her evident willingness to learn of anything that might conduce to social betterment.

Frank Stephens was 75 years of age. His death resulted from a sudden heart attack. He leaves a widow and two sons. He was born at Rahway in 1859 and graduated from Rutgers College. He taught sculpture at the Academy of Fine Arts in the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia. He was a lecturer for the New York Board of Education, Swarthmore Chautauqua and other organizations. With the late Will Price, who was an architect and a Single Taxer, he established the well-known Single Tax colony at Arden, Del. He associated himself with Fiske Warren in the founding of Single Tax "enclaves" and these two men were warm friends.

In the earlier days of the movement he worked with such well-known Single Taxers as Sam Millikin, Arthur Stephenson, Dr. Solis Cohen, Arthur C. Pleydell, William Ryan, Harold Sudell, and others of the faithful residing

in Philadelphia. He did yeoman work as a member of this group.

Frank Stephens' body was cremated on the afternoon of June 17 according to his wishes.

From *Every Evening* of Wilmington we extract the following:

Saturday night the two sons visited their father at Gilpin's Point. He had not seen them for several weeks and was so overjoyed at their visit that he immediately organized a campfire and invited neighbors. "The campfire was the same as that we have in Arden," said Donald today. "My father proved the life of the evening. He sang, recited and read Uncle Remus stories to us. He appeared to be in the best of health."

Early yesterday morning Mr. Stephens suffered a heart attack. Shortly before noon he appeared to be out of danger. He assured his sons there was nothing to worry about. The two sons then left by auto for Arden.

Unknown to them the father turned over on his side and closed his eyes in death just as the auto with his two sons left Gilpin's Point.

So died Frank Stephens, one of the many whom Henry George had touched with divine fire. But his work lives after him. Such a life is an inspiration. And his death is a distinct personal loss to many; the work he did and the example of his life and great service will re-act for many years to come.

From Dr. Solomon S. Cohen in a letter just received we quote the following:

We who worked with Frank Stephens, who were taught by him, and who heard him talk, on and off the platform, who were associated with him in the days of Delaware, cannot think of him as dead. His memory is a memory of vitality and vigor, of intense conviction, of earnest presentation. His was a logical philosophy, and at great sacrifice he made his life conform to it. His departure reduces yet further the small number of those who knew and worked with Henry George, and is a distinct loss of strength to the Georgian movement.

Lover of truth and freedom, brother to all mankind, loyal servant of the Idea, faithful friend, we shall miss him greatly in the few days that to us remain.

The following editorial appeared in the *Philadelphia Ledger*:

A well-known sculptor and teacher of art, Frank Stephens died last Sunday at Gilpin, Md. Monuments to his artistic abilities are some of the statues in Philadelphia City Hall. But his name was once more widely identified with the community of Arden, Del., which he founded to prove and practice his faith in the theory of Single Tax, as advocated by Henry George.

It is evidence of his executive abilities and the intensity of his convictions that he was the recognized leader of the Arden experiment for thirty-five years. It could be argued, indeed, that the community would hardly have kept its character so long without the presence of a strong and stubborn personality. Few theories in economics which contradict conventional practice and opinion can stand alone. Somebody must believe in them with abiding faith to perpetuate them against the pressure of the world about them.

There have been numerous experiments in social management and organization, under the tolerance allowed by the American system of government. Not the least interesting is the colony of Arden, now lacking the man who fought for the doctrine of Single Tax both in theory and practice.

Harold Sudell addressed the following letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger*:

On behalf of the Single Taxers of Philadelphia and its vicinity permit me to thank you for your kindly editorial on the passing of Frank Stephens of Arden. A man of brilliant mind, unusual ability and with a most loveable disposition, he gave up almost the whole of a long life to the service of his fellow-men. For half a century his main object was to bring about better social conditions through the adoption of the Henry George philosophy. No effort was too arduous and no sacrifice too great if the Single Tax cause could be helped by it.

He did not live to see the day of its coming but it is good to know that his unselfish work for the benefit of others was not unappreciated by many who knew him even if they did not see eye to eye with him as regards mankind's right to the use of the earth.

It was somewhat of a coincidence that on the day of his cremation the State Senate of Harrisburg should have defeated, by a vote of 32 to 17, the first bill ever before a Pennsylvania Legislature to give a measure of the Single Tax to the City in which Henry George, the Apostle of the Single Tax, was born. However, in view of the general lack of knowledge as to the Single Tax and its workings it is encouraging to know that 17 of our Senators would vote for such a measure. For no work had been done except on the committee which reported the bill favorably. So, if Frank Stephens were still here, he would be encouraged by the result of this vote.

#### A TRIBUTE FROM GRACE COLBRON

A living flame, smouldering always, then flashing out in bursts of brilliance . . . that was Frank Stephens.

As man . . . each day a new adventure for him. Nothing that had gone before could spoil his zest for each new happening.

As Thinker and Fighter . . . enlisting heart and soul for a dozen reforms but always in final clear realization of what was greatest of all; willing to sacrifice all the others for what he felt was fundamental Truth.

The sort of man to whom no one could remain indifferent. One either liked him whole-heartedly . . . or disliked him vehemently . . . sometimes both at one and the same time. That was Frank Stephens.

As speaker . . . one of the best. Standing at first with eyes half-closed, the rich voice muted, apparently neither caring for, or even aware of, his audience. Then gathering them up in growing fervor, sweeping them away in a torrent of eloquence that held them spellbound, thrilled, shaken. That was Frank Stephens.

Memory brings up one experience of Frank Stephens as speaker.

An actor friend was my guest, a man of intelligence, himself a good speaker with a fine voice which he knew how to use. We sat facing the audience. Frank was at his best that night.

Once I glanced at my friend. He was studying the audience intently. When the applause died away, I turned to get his reaction. It was enthusiastic. "I have never seen anyone, speaker or actor, hold an audience so completely in his power. He drew them up to the heights, then flung them down to the depths, almost in one breath. He played on their emotions as an organist might play on his great keyboard. It was magnificent."

Yes, even to an outsider, that was Frank Stephens. To us his comrades, and to the cause in which all his power was enlisted, his loss goes deep.

**F**ATHER COUGHLIN denounces the tariff as a sales tax operating entirely in favor of big business. Since all taxes on industry hurt the weak more than the strong the good father tells us nothing new, but it is nevertheless encouraging to note this glimmer of light in his tax programme.

## On the March With John Lawrence Munroe

FIELD DIRECTOR, THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF  
SOCIAL SCIENCE

SPEAKING APPOINTMENTS, MAY-JUNE, 1935

(With the approximate attendance and the name of person by whom each appointment was secured.)

Indianapolis, Ind.—Public meeting in Cropsey Auditorium, Public Library; 20; William E. Barker, Chairman; May 31.

Covington, Ky.—Junior Chamber of Commerce; 60; Paul C. Williamson, Pres.; arranged by Charles H. Haase; June 3.

Dayton, O.—Annual Banquet, School of Commerce, Y. M. C. A. Junior College; 25; Dean Alan S. Wilson; June 4.

Cincinnati, O.—Conference, home of Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn, 318 Forest Avenue, 18; June 5.

Niles, O.—Exchange Club; 30; James F. Wick; June 17.

Youngstown, O.—United Labor Congress; 50; John F. Conroy; June 17. Henry George Land Restoration League; 50; W. O. Blase, Pres.; June 20.

Coshocton, O.—Rotary Club; 60; Fred Cantwell; June 18.

Painesville, O.—Public Meeting; 25; H. Bieder; June 26.

#### FIELD NOTES

Indianapolis, Ind.—A train boy sold Tom L. Johnson the copy of "Social Problems" that was to make him one of the great leaders in the Henry George movement. That train boy is living today in Indianapolis—Frank Brown, now a coffee merchant. Mr. Brown is proud of his convert for what he accomplished. But George J. Lindeman of Indianapolis is proud of another convert for what he is going to accomplish. Mr. Lindeman's convert is youthful O. B. Hanger. Mr. Hanger is active among the Young Republicans, is an able speaker, and is unique and persuasive in his approach to the philosophy of Henry George. He is a recent graduate of law school, and has his own successful insurance business. He is interested in the Henry George School of Social Science and will make an excellent teacher. Among others who will assure the success of Extension Classes in Indianapolis are Mr. William E. Barker, who once introduced Henry George in a campaign in Rhode Island, and his son-in-law, Russell Edwards.

Covington, Ky.—An extension course of the School will be sponsored in the fall by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. There is not a finer nor more wide awake group of young men in the country than is to be found in this organization. On June 10, following a talk by

Mr. Monroe on "Youth and the New Frontier," a committee was appointed to arrange for the ten-weeks class. Mr. James E. Gunning is chairman. Others actively interested include Paul C. Williamson, president of the Junior Chamber, Thomas Logan, attorney; and Dr. Thomas Sullivan, who first became interested in Henry George through Rev. Herbert Bigelow.

Cincinnati, O.—A couple of years ago the Schalkenbach Foundation circularized the Rabbis of the nation with copies of Henry George's address on "Moses", and Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn of Cincinnati read it and was impressed. Last summer, instead of going to the University as he usually does, he read "Progress and Poverty." During the year that has elapsed his devotion to the cause of Henry George has mounted with time for reflection. He has delivered several important addresses on the philosophy before conventions of veterans' organizations in which he is active. When Mr. Monroe came to Cincinnati in June he arranged a conference at his home. Among his guests were Dr. Abraham Cronbach, Professor of Jewish Social Studies, Hebrew Union College, Rev. Carl H. Olson, First Universalist Church; and a number of Henry George people including, Rev. Herbert Bigelow, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar A. Toepfert, Fenton Lawson, Francis B. McConaughy and Robert C. Harris. As a result of this conference, extension classes will open in Cincinnati in the fall. The extension committee is composed of Mr. McConaughy, chairman, Rabbi Aaronsohn, vice-chairman, and Mr. E. E. Hardcastle, secretary.

Writing to the School, Rabbi Aaronsohn says, "I feel we have gone forward. You must keep in constant touch with us until we are firmly established. We want to be an active part of a very active whole." It is this spirit that will put the School "over the top." Rabbi Aaronsohn, by the way, was with Abe D. Waldauer in the Argonne, where he lost his sight. He has "Significant Paragraphs" in Braille, though the unabridged edition of "Progress and Poverty" was read to him by his associate, Rabbi Harry B. Pastor.

Other cities in Ohio which will have extension classes starting in the fall are Hamilton, Dayton, Coshocton, Youngstown, Warren and Painesville, as well as Toledo, which has already brought two classes to a close, and Cleveland, which had its first commencement dinner on June 27 with 131 graduated from four classes. Details as to the progress of the extension classes in these and other cities throughout the country will be published in the next issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

**T**HE New York State Constitution, Article I, Section 10, reads "The people, in their right of sovereignty, are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property in, and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State."

## Activities of the Manhattan Single Tax Club

**T**HE opportunity to reach from 50,000 to a quarter million of the lay-public weekly is of great importance, and in my estimation, of greater importance than any lecturing or publicity work that has so far been done.

The knowledge of radio technique and the extent of the audience is so rare at this stage of the radio development, that I have asked Mr. Lane, who has assisted me in getting 'time' for over 2,000 broadcasts in the last three years, to make a statement which I am appending.

The vital thing is to get radio fans to tune in and to assimilate the talks, in order to do which you will notice from examples herewith, I am using the simplest of language and avoiding technical phrases familiar to Single Taxers, my only idea being to abate nothing of the principle while avoiding unfamiliar terms.

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL.

### FROM SECRETARY LANE

To help get the attention of friends of the Henry George movement that Mr. Ingersoll's broadcasting deserves, I would like to state certain facts that they probably know nothing of:

Mr. Ingersoll is cultivating a public taste for economics, by his ingenious and intriguing interweaving of the 'dismal science' with daily happenings; and by the judicious use of a most active sense of humor. From many quarters it is evident that he has reduced to a fine art this balancing of entertainment with education.

Furthermore, he is converting the programme directors of the radio stations to the idea that radio audiences are not averse to listening to common sense, if attractively presented.

Mr. Ingersoll's radio technique equals that of any broadcaster, I firmly believe; it is marvelous, the amount of material he can pack into a 15 minute talk, without apparent haste, and with every important word, point and sentence made completely impressive.

This schedule, now at sixteen broadcasts, (temporarily down from twenty) is not only double a year ago in number, but many times multiplied in character of stations, and total size of audience.

Sunday: WHOM, 10 p. m.

Monday: WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Tuesday: WOV, 11:15 a. m., WLTH, 1:15 p. m., WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Wednesday: WWRL, 1:15 p. m., WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Thursday: WCNW, 2:30 p. m., WHOM, 10 p. m.

Friday: WILM, 3:30 p. m., Wilmington; WDAS, 5:15 p. m., Philadelphia.

Saturday: WDAS, 10:45 a. m., WWRL, 10:45 p. m.  
These stations are all 1400 to 1500 k.c.

While methods of measuring actual listeners to a given broadcast are not perfect, there is no doubt that Mr. Ingersoll's audiences on these stations average 5,000 as a minimum and most likely go to a total of 250,000 weekly.

Confirming this estimate are the commercial values of the time on the air that Mr. Ingersoll, because of his name, and the merit of his broadcasts, gets free:—the Standard Rate and Data Service publishes the detailed rate for all the stations of the country; and it shows that *these spots of fifteen minutes as scheduled each would be billed to any commercial buyer at \$452.29 per week cash.*

As to expansion of this economic broadcasting; this may be done without limit, and with decreasing resistance, as Mr. Ingersoll's splendid work becomes more familiar to programme directors; it is only a matter of persistence—in which I know no equal to Mr. Ingersoll—to get to the very top—the big network; and only a nominal effort will be required to build his broadcasting to many times its present distribution.—THOMAS T. LANE

Following are three extracts from Mr. Ingersoll's radio addresses:

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment is on the increase and that goes for both labor and capital. The official figures from Washington tell us that unemployment has gone up something like a half million in the last month and not much less increase for the past year; of course Miss Secretary Perkins will now issue an interpretation of these official figures in language possibly not quite familiar to radio fans; but even she will not dare claim any improvement; so much for labor.

Now the New York State Banking Department has announced the reduction of bank interest rates from two and one-half per cent to two per cent; so page Dr. Coughlin and let him know that Wall Street is also suffering from unemployment; this and the Morgan item should gradually gain his sympathy for Wall Street and maybe a little less for Huey Long and the President, socking the rich and taxing big business until it's little; and to all of these campaigners:—*you cannot injure capital without injuring labor and you cannot injure wealth without injuring both capital and labor; but you can wipe out and destroy monopoly; and if you do not, you may as well forget these other raids you all propose.*

#### TRUE CONSERVATISM

The conservative Democrats and the conservative Republicans are showing signs of getting together to oppose radicalism in both parties. Ex-Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, and Chief Justice Pattangall, of Maine, are the voices of this urge; and I have been much interested to read their respective statements of the needs of our country for a party of conservatism, and these statements are well phrased and unquestionably cover real and fundamental needs. Nevertheless, I fail to see in either of these statements the needed definition of those two words *conservative* and *radical*, without which definition we must assume that conservatism means standing still and doing nothing, as distinguished from the radicalism that plunges into beaureaucratic and socialistic experiments. Without the new and only logical definition, this movement is foredoomed to failure in meeting the demands of the hour. *Conservatism is conserving the social value of the nation, in order to make them in turn conserve the private property and wealth of the people. If bi-partisanship can agree on this definition, the time of our deliverance is approaching.*

#### MEMORIAL DAY

The day on which we would recall the extreme service and the supreme sacrifice of our army veterans we decorate the graves of those that lost out in the ridiculously unequal battle of brain and brawn against bullets.

It seems to me rather a waste of a day if sentiment and emotion—even if patriotic—be its objective; but if we could devote it honestly to looking war squarely and unflinchingly in the face, as our boys faced the enemy's guns, it might become our most useful patriotic holiday.

Armistice Day, Memorial Day and the 4th of July, as days of glorification or toleration of the institution of mass murder, ought to be discouraged; and these days should be devoted to humble search for the reason why a pretentious civilization such as ours falls for almost complete self-destruction periodically. Socialists and Communists are setting us a good example in refusal to countenance war; they are our only persistent and consistent conscientious objectors; they say wars are promoted by the capitalist class to maintain its supremacy and forestall revolution.

But because they have confused capital with special privilege, their fallacy is one of continuing war of class against class and with no peace at the end even if succeeding in their aims; revolution is their only way of achievement.

But there is a simple way to avoid war and revolution—the democratic way of denying to any but the producers any part in the division of the product; this would double wages, provide jobs for all and make buying power always sufficient to insure good times to all.

And while it may not seem obvious that depression, unemployment and poverty cause our international wars, I am sure that the honest inquiry these patriotic holidays might afford would show these economic conditions of distress to be the only cause of wars.

## The California Movement

I WANT to submit a partial report of the progress of the movement to secure the adoption of the constitutional amendment in the State of California which looks forward to the speedy installation of at least fifty per cent of the great reform in which we are interested.

As the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM know, our place upon the ballot is secure for the submission of the amendment at the general election in November, 1936. To accomplish this we had to obtain the signatures of about 111,000 registered voters in the State. This was done with a surplusage of about 25,000, and these signatures have all been passed upon and reported to the Secretary of the State.

It is within the power of the Governor to have the amendment submitted at an earlier special election, but he has no love for it and will take no step which might lead to its speedy adoption. This adoption he has on repeated occasions, as indicated by the newspapers, shown he regards as probable.

First, a word with regard to the progress of organization. The campaign is now, so far as all details of management are concerned, in the hands of two very efficient men. In San Francisco, Mr. Noah D. Alper, No. 83 McAllister St., is in charge, and in Los Angeles, Mr. Franklin Lowney, No. 7619 Wilshire Boulevard.

Mr. Alper is easily one of the most informed, energetic and enthusiastic advocates that could possibly have been named. For his introduction into the campaign we are largely indebted to John Lawrence Monroe. Mr. Lowney, while a newcomer in our ranks, is a man of wide experience in campaign work and with tact and energy. Because of very efficient work on his part in other directions, he was strongly recommended by an old personal friend of mine, Dr. George Winfield Scott of Los Angeles. Mr. Lowney's work is being carried on in connection with a local committee, which includes men of prominence in Los Angeles, like Mr. E. W. Camp,



Dr. Norman Kilbourne, our old friend R. E. Chadwick, and others; the entire number of the committee not yet being complete.

In San Francisco, Mr. Alper is making connections with business men and organizations, as well as with a group of very efficient labor men who are profound believers in the movement. The same is true of Mr. Lowney in Los Angeles.

In San Diego, Mr. E. M. Stangland is actively engaged in letter-writing and appearing before organizations and pressing our proposition with skill and efficiency.

In the central valleys of California our most active representative is George W. Cartwright, of Modesto, who is carrying on extensive letterwriting and arranging to appear before a number of bodies.

I should not omit Mr. Fred W. Workman, of Pacific Grove, who is a tower of strength in his part of the State.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille, now visiting her former State, is rendering every possible assistance.

I have, of course, not enumerated many who are rendering active and energetic assistance but whose responsibility is largely self-imposed while less strenuous than those whose names have been given.

A notable feature of the campaign so far is the large amount of new blood infused into the movement. This was to be expected, because as I have had occasion to say to our friends in several Eastern cities, we do not know the strength of our own cause nor the extent to which it has entered into the public consciousness.

Are we likely to succeed? It is of course, too early, with a sixteen months' campaign ahead of us, to speak with absolute assurance, the more so that we all understand that we have before us an extremely bitter campaign, which will grow the more so as election day approaches. This campaign on the part of our opponents will be financed to an extent with which we cannot hope to compete. All the forces of reaction will be against us. Nevertheless, with justice on our side, for we are told, "Thrice armed is he who hath his quarrel just," we believe we are bound to secure victory.

Will the friends of the movement in the United States back us with their power, which for the most part represents dollars they can give? We believe we have a right to appeal to them if they care as much for the cause as they profess. If they possess sufficient imagination to understand that this means the transfer within a limited period of time, of all taxation upon tangible personal property and improvements to land values, and that this will involve the ultimate transfer of \$100,000,000 a year from privilege to industry—if they believe that such a transfer will by its example and results lead the way for a movement which will extend throughout the United States and even abroad, and that a great blow for freedom will be struck, they will not hesitate to come forward in the most generous manner.

With all this our friends the enemy have done their share to assist us. By imposing recent sales taxes, they have opened the way for us not only to get rid of them—and that is part of our programme—but at the same time to show that all taxation upon tangible personal property and upon improvements is nothing but a sales tax. Thus they have intensified the struggle and put weapons against themselves into our hands.

What will your readers do about it?

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

## Henry George Congress To Meet September 23-25

**S**INGLE TAXERS from all sections of the United States will assemble in New York City, September 23-25, for the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress, and New York Georgists are already actively at work cooperating with the officers of the Henry George Foundation for the purpose of making this year's convention of the greatest possible practical value to the movement and to all persons participating.

A special effort is being made to secure Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, as one of the principal convention speakers, and if Mr. Hull is able to accept he will likely discuss the tariff question, as the Secretary of State is one of the strongest advocates of the lowering of tariff barriers between nations. As heretofore, some of the outstanding men and women in the Single Tax movement, will address the convention. The speaking programme this year will, however, be greatly curtailed, and those who are to address the convention will be carefully selected with a view to co-ordinating and directing the discussion along channels likely to result in definite contributions to the advancement of the Single Tax movement.

As we go to press, it is too early to make definite announcements as to the details of the convention programme, but among those tentatively listed to address public sessions of the convention are Mayor Wm. N. McNair and Councilman George E. Evans, of Pittsburgh, Congressman Charles R. Eckert, of Pennsylvania, Peter Witt of Cleveland, Mrs. Anna George de Mille and Charles O'Connor Hennessy of New York.

Edmund P. Donovan, of the Henry George New York School, has been appointed Chairman of the Convention Committee, and among those who will serve with him on this committee are Joseph Dana Miller, Leonard T. Recker, Mrs. Anna George de Mille, Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, Mrs. Roswell Skeel, Jr., Frederic C. Leibuscher, Benjamin W. Burger, Mrs. Terese F. Burger, Miss Helen D. Denbigh, Otto K. Dorn, Charles H. Ingersoll, Bolton Hall, Lawson Purdy, Frank Chodorov, Walter Fairchild, Harry Weinberger, Norman C. B. Fowles, John Lawrence Monroe, Clayton J. Ewing, Abe D. Waldauer, Carl D. Smith, John H. Allen, Will Atkinson, Charles G. Baldwin, Harold Sudell, Grace Isabel Colbron, Walter G. Stewart, Otto Cullman, Fenton Lawson, J. C. Lincoln, Dr. Mark Millikin, Harry W. Olney, August Williges, Fiske Warern. Mr. Folke, famous Danish Single Taxer, is coming and there is also a prospect of having Mr. A. W. Madson with us.

As has been the custom, the convention will be in continuous session for a three-day period, opening on Mon-

**C**HILD labor is but one of the evils resulting from employment of adults with childish ideas as legislators. Just now these legislators think they are helping the child laborers by fussing with a proposed constitutional amendment which leaves fundamental causes alone. An amendment doing away with fundamental evils would be strenuously opposed by them.

day morning, September 23. It is planned to devote the first day's session largely to the activities of the Henry George School of Social Science and the Henry George Fellowship, and those active in the School and the Fellowship are working with the convention committee with a view to having a very large representation of the younger element, not only from New York but from various other cities and towns where Extension Classes have been conducted with marked success.

Invitations will go out through the mail to the thousands of active Single Taxers giving further details concerning the programme and other arrangements, and all who plan to participate are urged to make early reservations and cooperate toward making this year's convention one of the best ever held.

The Hotel New Yorker is the place selected for the Conference.

## An Appeal to Single Taxers for Action

FROM THE LAND LEAGUE

IT is proposed that we make a determined effort, through petitions to legislators, to vote for taxation of land values, and an intelligent, persistent, and widely supported follow-up of legislators.

The means to accomplish this would consist in a membership large enough to merit the attention of legislators. One legislator would then be requested to introduce a measure, and all legislators would be urgently requested by the full membership, to support such a measure. The League would follow up the voting, and the members would use this information as a guide in the next election.

It is hoped that a nucleus of such an organization can be had among those already converted to Single Tax. This is an appeal to them to register with the League, and to sign and mail application for membership. There are no dues and no obligations beyond the promise of political cooperation. There will be no affiliation with any political party.

Please address the Association as follows:  
American Association for Scientific Taxation,  
11 Park Place, N. Y., N. Y.

No card will be filed except with the individual envelope in which it was mailed to the League's office. This will certify to the genuineness of the list, and make for effectiveness.

It is hoped that some effective work can be accomplished with an initial membership of present Single Taxers, but it is our purpose to make a drive to enroll the unemployed, the underpaid, the tax victim, and every other citizen who can be made to see that he is a victim of of the dumped labor and enforced idleness of land monopoly. It may be possible to do this over the radio, and by any other means the members can suggest. It is felt that a most effective means for enrolling the general public will be the advertising and agitation resulting from the introduction and follow-up of bills in each legislature. There is probably no better inducement to membership in a society than the sight of action, and the opening provided to the individual to take part in action.

Yours for action

COMMITTEE OF THE LAND LEAGUE.

WHEN a government costs thirteen billions a year to maintain and won't even prevent a depression what do we get for our money?

## Commencement Dinner of The Henry George School

AN event of great interest to Single Taxers in New York was the Third Commencement Dinner of the Henry George School of Social Science, which was held on Thursday, June 13, at the Town Hall. One hundred and fifteen certificates were issued by the School to those who had completed the course. A large gathering met to welcome the graduates into the Henry George Fellowship, and to hear brief addresses from both old and new friends of the Single Tax. It was a great pleasure to have as guests of honor Mrs. Nina C. Geiger, Dr. George R. Geiger, and his young wife.

Mr. Harry C. Weinberger acted as toastmaster. The first speaker was Mr. Raymond V. McNally, who said that the Henry George School teaches the doctrine of real freedom, not the freedom of the Liberty League. Mr. Harold S. Buttenheim, editor of *The American City*, who has been actively interested in the subject of slum clearance, said that the housing problem will never be solved until the land problem is. "Commodore" Walter Fairchild of the Mahwah River Yacht Club, issued a hearty invitation to all to attend the annual outing there on June 29. Miss Charlotte Schetter spoke briefly, and Miss Helen D. Denbigh reported that the work of the School is now being carried on in classes throughout fourteen States. Dr. George R. Geiger asked to be excused from making a long address, explaining that he was on both a vacation and his honeymoon. He spoke, however, on the need for a popular approach to economics from a new angle; the necessity of getting away from cliches of capitalism, money, etc., and back to the really vital issue, the land question. The majority interpret this literally and narrowly, consider the land question to have reference merely to agriculture, rural communities, the farm, and dismiss the idea glibly as old-fashioned and outmoded. The Henry George School, he said, teaches the true significance of the land question, which, as we know, has a direct and inescapable relation to and influence upon every economic activity of man. His next book, Dr. Geiger said, would probably deal with this topic.

Mr. O. K. Dorn introduced the graduates. First to speak was Miss Sally Kurz. She expressed the regret of all present at the illness of Director Norman C. B. Fowles, which prevented his attending the dinner. She paid tribute to the inspiration and enlightenment his pupils had received from him. The graduates gave a rising vote of thanks for his leadership, and requested that he reconsider his decision to resign as director. Dr. Osias L. Friedman, after voicing his appreciation of the course, remarked that the meeting was too silent. People with a great idea like ours should be seething with the

will to "do something." Miss Pauline Friptu, of Free Acres, N. J., the Single Tax colony founded by Mr. Bolton Hall, said that she became interested in the idea from seeing its practical working out, and finally decided to find out the theory. Mr. Valerian Belinski said that nowhere is there such cohesion between the economic and the moral side of life as is to be found in the teaching of Henry George. Mr. Heman L. Chase recommended that we follow the lead of modern educational practice, and teach people rather than a subject; that we study the individuals to be taught the Single Tax, and start from what they know, making use of the steps in the learning process. We should avoid arguing, but, instead, rise to the dignity of the subject.

During the term a group of young people became so much inspired by the truth of Henry George's teaching that they determined to make themselves more articulate in order better to promulgate it. Under the guidance of Mr. Frank Morgan they pursued a course in public speaking simultaneously with their other studies, and several of their number showed to what good effect their energies had been directed. Among the other speakers were Mr. William Preston, Miss Amelia Romaka, Mr. John B. Maran, Mr. Lancaster Greene, Mr. Walter Gainey, Miss Hilda G. Pollock, Miss Sonia Skutzka, Miss Blanch U. Davis, and Mr. Arthur Vetterman. Mrs. Adeleine Muhlenberg paid glowing tribute to the inspiring teaching of Mr. John Luxton, who conducts classes in Brooklyn. She referred to him as truly a master. Other instructors who received encomiums from their appreciative pupils were Mr. Dorn, Mr. Bell, Mr. Fairchild, Mr. Recker, and Mr. Smith.

The sincerity and enthusiasm of the majority of the people who take the course, and the firmness of their grounding in fundamental economics and in the social philosophy of Henry George, are very encouraging to those interested in the Henry George School. These things, together with a steady increase in the number of pupils each term, bear out the hopes and expectations of the beloved founder, Oscar H. Geiger. Truly it seems that his spirit still guides and strengthens this institution, which promises to rekindle and to spread anew those fires of truth which yet may light the dark places of the world.—MARGARET F. BINGHAM.

## School Outing

**S**ATURDAY, June 29, was sultry and hot. People in the city were wiping the beads from their foreheads while collars wilted, but the crowd that gathered at the New York end of the George Washington Bridge was cheerful and gay for they were leaving the city and its hubub for a refreshing ride over the great bridge to Jersey and then up to Suffern, New York, to the home of Walter Fairchild on the banks of the Mahwah River. Not enough privately owned cars were volunteered to carry all that came, so a mammoth bus was chartered that all might ride in comfort; then through that beauti-

ful country-side to the home of our host, nestled in the valley at the foot of the Ramapo Mountains.

### STUDENTS OUTNUMBER OLD-TIMERS

The crowd upon arrival seemed so different from the more or less formal one that had left the city. The spirit of youth prevailed and democracy was the order of the day. Shorts, sailor garbs and swim suits took the place of chiffons and flannels. Handball, tennis, canoeing, etc., followed. Lunch was served under a canvass, and "if the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof," then Bob Clancy, Chairman of the Commissary Department, certainly deserves our gratitude for there was nothing left excepting our memory of what we had seen on the table when the dinner bell was first sounded.

**SPEECHES!**—of course we had speeches,—no Georgist meeting complete without them, but the chairman assured us they would be short and snappy. So we gathered on the lawn and were cooled by soft breezes that were pushing dark storm clouds in our direction at an appalling rate. But fate was kind. The breezes cooled while the dark clouds not only shielded us from the hot sun but also served as a warning to the speakers to make it lively.

Our genial host, Walter Fairchild, greeted the crowd in his usual jovial manner and then presented Mr. Dorn, the chairman who spoke on the opportunities and the work of the Alumni. He then presented several members of the Student-Alumni the first of which was Mr. Charles Erwood who has done such excellent work as Chairman of the Library Committee, who spoke on books for the library. Mr. Norman Fowles, Jr., read an interesting paper by his associate Daniel Alberga, on the graded tax plan, and incidentally mentioned that Mr. Alberga is writing a series of four articles in one of the Brooklyn newspapers on this subject. Miss Denbigh, President of the Student-Alumni Council, spoke most encouragingly on the prospects of the fall term. Her message was inspiring as usual.

Several other friends of the movement spoke, including Mr. Louis Kerwin, who came all the way from Philadelphia to attend the Outing, but the real surprise was occasioned by the appearance of John Lawrence Monroe, Field Director of the School, who reported the progress of the Extension Classes that are being formed and conducted in all parts of the country.

One of the speakers was mystified by the sudden laughter of the audience, until he turned toward the water to see what it was all about. It was this way. Mr. Don Megna and his friend had been quietly cruising near the shore in a canoe which was suddenly capsized. Don and his friend came to the surface O.K., with their clothes clinging tightly to their figures and were safely brought ashore. No casualties reported, and a good laugh was had by all.

## Mr. Fowles Retires as Director of the Henry George School

**L**ABORING under the same strenuous load that took his predecessor, the late Oscar H. Geiger, the founder and first director of the Henry George School of Social Science, Mr. Norman C. B. Fowles, also broken in health, has asked to be relieved of the responsibility of the directorship at the close of the Spring semester.

Mr. Fowles is an exceptional teacher. He is especially well informed in economics, also specializing in philosophy, psychology and other subjects. It is sincerely hoped that his recovery will be speedy and permanent. His successor has not yet been found.

Friends of the movement everywhere point with pride to the success of the School and the increase in the number of Extension Classes that have been organized and conducted in all parts of the country. However, the preponderance of the burden of this responsibility has fallen heavily—too heavily—upon the director. In order to enable the incoming director to devote his efforts exclusively to educational matters and to conserve his energies for the more important work

of training an efficient teaching staff, if the School is expected to continue its growth in these proportions, it will be necessary to relieve the head of the School of many of the duties that have heretofore fallen upon his shoulders, by having competent assistants to look after the numerous details and the many problems coincident to the rapid expansion of the School. This, however, will mean a larger staff and incidentally a larger budget.

Will the friends of the movement come forward and underwrite this—the greatest and most effective educational work that has been done in fundamental economics since the days of Henry George? It is this question that is perplexing the trustees of the School at present.

Never before have people been so responsive and so anxious to learn the answer to the economic problem that is baffling the world as now. The depression and the wide-spread poverty on the one hand, and the futile and wasteful efforts of our politicians who are endeavoring to effect recovery without knowing the cause of the depression on the other hand, makes this an opportune time to advance the Georgean idea, which furnishes the only answer to this economic enigma.

Never before have we had in our hands a method by which the work can be taught as effectively and as completely as by the School method, which is not only thorough but also convincing. It brings young men and women into the movement who are not satisfied merely to know the answer, they want action!

This is the opportune moment. The School and the value of the classroom method of teaching "Progress and Poverty" is proven. The results will follow in exact proportion to the number of pupils our means will enable us to enroll.

## A Memorable Meeting in Washington

ON Sunday, June 9, the Single Taxers of Washington and nearby towns in Maryland and Virginia, met for their twenty-fourth annual picnic at the home of Mrs. Jessie Lane Keeley in Riverdale, Md., with about fifty present.

The announcement had been broadcast by the hostess that this year the guests were to come unaccompanied by lunches as this was to be her treat in celebration of her retirement about a fortnight before, from Government service, where she had been employed on editorial work in the Department of Labor since 1917.

A bountifully spread table greeted those who came, and after full justice had been done to the tempting array of good things, there followed an impromptu programme, with Mrs. Keeley acting as chairman.

The first speaker, Honorable Charles R. Eckert of Pennsylvania, said that since coming to Congress, he realized more fully than ever before, the difficulties in the way of getting policies and theories of government enacted into law, and urged an attitude of friendliness toward the Administration while pointing out errors in policy and striving to bring to the attention of the President, that more comprehensive subject, the land question. The Supreme Court had done a favor, Mr. Eckert believed, in declaring the NRA unconstitutional. The States have fallen down in the matter of taking charge of those functions which properly come under their jurisdiction, and have failed in the organization and management of the economic problem, and so it was taken up by the Federal Government, and the President, in his effort to correct what should have been done by the States in years gone by, sets up a programme and undertakes to regulate industry, which, under conditions of freedom and justice, natural law could be trusted to govern much better than we could do by making codes. It would be fine if we could get a policy established that would embody the principles of the Single Tax. The task of con-

verting the great body of humanity is beyond our ability; we can make greater headway by concentrating our efforts on those who are in positions of leadership, and we should therefore remain on good terms with the Administration. Attention was called to John Z. White's recent book on "The Basic Functions of Government" which was declared to be of great value to Single Taxers. One of the most promising developments that have taken place along the line of education is the Henry George School of Social Science, whose students are sure to get their economics on straight, and a good percentage of them will probably act as teachers in turn, to spread the gospel to others, and from this way develop a leadership that will eventually carry on the battle to victory, for as Henry George says, "When there is correct thinking, correct action will follow." It is to be hoped that with the confusion and bewilderment existing at present among those in authority, Single Taxers will crystallize and organize their forces and bring pressure to bear upon those who have the power to produce results. We are at the crossroads today and must either go forward to fuller freedom or retreat to greater oppression.

Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, professional dramatic reader and inventor of the "Landlord's Game" for teaching the principles of the Single Tax, expressed hearty agreement with Mr. Eckert's reference to the need of crystallizing and organizing our forces, and declared that the cause stood in need of a systematic publicity campaign of education under the guidance of a first-class organizer. There is now much excellent talent going to waste which might well be utilized to further our cause. It is true our speakers are pretty well organized and used by the Henry George Lecture Bureau, but we have not systematically utilized our letter writers, debaters, broadcasters, actors, readers, story writers, poets, artists, or cartoonists, to say nothing of the hundreds of willing workers scattered throughout the country who only need some plan of action mapped out for them to be of great value to us.

Mr. Walter I. Swanton, who has been faithfully "carrying on" since the loss of Mrs. Swanton, told of his recent trip to New England, where he found unemployment among the "white-collar workers" increasing despite our boasted recovery, and cited a case of three or four hundred men being engaged in writing names on cards for the purpose of keeping them employed, and he thought what a pity it was that their time and energy could not be better used—in working for the Single Tax, for instance. Mr. Swanton urged our cooperation in helping to bring about the California constitutional amendment calling for the repeal of the present odious sales tax and prevention of its reenactment under any guise; the exemption from taxation of improvements to the extent of \$1,000 on homesteads; and the exemption of all personal property in five years, at the rate of twenty per cent each year. This amendment, following a referendum in which the petition received more than 100,000 signatures, will be placed on the ballot in the election of 1936, and with the passage of these four provisions, it is hoped and expected that a new era of prosperity will dawn on this Pacific Coast State of the Golden West.

Mrs. Marie H. Heath, president of the Woman's Single Tax Club of the District of Columbia, seconded Mr. Swanton's plea for help in passing the California amendment, pledged the support of the club in this undertaking, and asked that contributions be brought or mailed to her home, 2801 Adams Mill Road, Apt. 409, Washington, D. C.

Mr. George A. Warren, law editor of the Interior Department, was the next speaker, and no doubt voiced the sentiment of all present when he said that since the NRA road out of the economic depression had to be abandoned, Single Taxers wished with all their heart that the Single Tax road might be chosen, but this was not to be—at least, for the present. Even if the Single Tax were to be enacted into law today, he predicted that the Supreme Court would knock it out, unless perhaps it were passed by an overwhelming majority. The speaker called attention to the fact that the question of whether the Supreme Court should be given the power to declare an Act of Congress unconstitutional, has been turned down three times in the

Constitutional Convention, and no such power is given in the Constitution nor exercised in any other country. Mr. Warren expressed satisfaction in the fact that a very much larger number of Americans were today doing more independent thinking along economic lines than ever before, and declared this boded well, for it had been his observation during a quarter of a century that for one person he had met who knew enough to argue concerning the Single Tax, there were two score that either knew nothing whatever about it, or merely recognized the name and that it was a cause advocated by a man named Henry George—the man the cigar was named after. Mr. Warren believed that Single Taxers could, without abating one jot of their zeal and effort for the Single Tax, lend their support to a number of movements or causes making for human betterment, such as free trade; reform of judicial system; the movement for peace among the nations by ceasing to build great armies and navies, and substituting conference on equal terms; the movement to conserve our natural resources, especially water power, and last but by no means least, everywhere and always championing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage, and freedom to obtain industrial democracy through collective bargaining.

Brief contributions to the programme were also made by Mr. L. W. Biddle of Takoma Park, Md., and Mr. Francis I. Mooney of Baltimore, Md.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

## Code for The Agricultural Artel

ADOPTED BY THE SECOND ALL-UNION CONGRESS OF COLLECTIVE FARM UDARNIKS AND CONFIRMED BY THE SOVIET OF PEOPLES' COMMISSARS OF THE USSR, FEB. 17, 1935.

### 1. PURPOSES AND TASKS

**T**HE working peasants of the villages and country voluntarily unite in the (name) Artel, to construct a collective economy by general means of production and collectively organized labor, to secure full victory over the kulak, over all exploiters and enemies of the toilers of hand or brain, to conquer hunger and darkness, overcome the backwardness of small individual agriculture, create a high productivity of labor, and thus secure a better life for the collective farmers.

The members of the Artel pledge themselves to strengthen their organization, work honestly, divide the collective farm income according to the work done by each member, protect the general property, guard the common good, care well for the tractors, machines and horses, fulfill all duties to the workers and peasants government—and so make this collective farm bolshevist and all collective farmers prosperous.

### 2. ABOUT THE LAND

All boundary marks, formerly dividing the separate lands of the members of the Artel, are to be abolished, and all lands converted into a single unit, for the collective use of the Artel.

The land occupied by the artel, like all land in the USSR, is the general property, of the people. According to the law of the workers and peasants government, it is placed at the disposal of the artel for perpetual use, forever, and shall not be bought, sold or rented.

The District Executive Committee of the Soviets will give to the artel a government deed for the perpetual use of the land, in which will be established its measurements and exact boundaries. Reduction of the size of this area shall not be permitted, but it may be increased—either by adding to it free land from the government fund or from excess land occupied by individual farmers.

From the land of the Artel there shall be given to each collective farm household for its personal use enough land for a garden or orchard. The size of these household lots, not counting the area under the habitation or buildings, may vary from a half-acre to an acre, and in some districts two acres, according to local conditions, established by the Peoples' Commissars of Agriculture of the republics.

It is forbidden to separate from the artel the lands of members leaving the collective farm. Those who leave the artel may receive land only from the free lands of the government fund.

The lands of the artel will be divided into fields according to the approved sequence of grain cultivation. Each field working brigade shall be given a permanent part of the land as its responsibility during the whole cycle of cultivation.

### 3. ABOUT THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION

The following shall be general property:

All working animals, cultivating equipment (plows, seeding machines, cultivators, thrashing machines, harvesters) seed stocks, enough feed for the collective farm cattle, general farm buildings, and all equipment for handling the collective farm products.

The following remain in individual use:

All dwellings, personal cattle and fowls, and such buildings as are needed for the cattle belonging to individual households. Also all small tools and equipment needed for the work of the individual household land allotments.

From the general working cattle the directors of the artel may set aside some horses for the service of the individual members, for pay.

Then follow other sections which give the rules for the management of the artel, the organization of its work, and other matters.

None of the rules make any mention of the ownership or control of clothing, household tools, utensils or other individual property, nor of children or other family matters. The reason these are not mentioned is that, contrary to some popular notions in America, all these things remain the private property and personal affair of individuals in the USSR.—A. H. JENKINS.

## Opinion Makers in Our Day

**O**NE of the most significant facts that a student of these troubled times in the United States must observe, is that a great many of the public commentators upon social and economical affairs are expositors of some more or less nebulous Socialist or Communist philosophy, which demands vital changes in the existing order of things.

A writer in a recent issue of *Unity* (edited by Dr. John Haynes Holmes), declares that the small group of Union Square agitators who, in pre-depression days, were "distinguished by their preference for soiled linen and their pent-up hatred of the capitalist system," have now had their numbers greatly augmented by many more or less distinguished persons, mostly from the literary craft. The *Unity* writer proceeds to mention only a few of the "converts to the religion of Marx" who are now, it seems, enlisted for some sort of a revolution in this country. Among these are Edmund Wilson, Newton Arvin, Malcolm Cowley and Granville Hicks. He might, I think, have added Heyward Brown, Walter Lippmann, Stuart Chase and most of the editors of *Unity*, as well as of *The Nation*, *The New Republic*, and of the very influential *Christian Century*.

Indeed, I think one might fairly be able to include among the left wingers a few of the noted book reviewers of our metropolitan press, not to mention a raft of young college professors and some of the noted religious preachers of the day.

The sincerity and good faith of these gentlemen seem to me to be beyond question. Most of them are ardent

idealists not afraid of being classed as radicals, but the pity of it is, as it seems to me, that they are not radical at all, because of their seeming inability to perceive the root of things in their desire for the social and economic regeneration of a very sick world.

For the edification of the readers of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, I would like from time to time to submit and comment upon samples of the outgivings of some of these "opinion-makers."

\* \* \*

Just now I must content myself with offering a few observations about Rexford Guy Tugwell, one-time Columbia professor, now Under Secretary of Agriculture, and reputed Brain Truster Number One. There is considerable evidence that because of his influence in guiding vital public policies at Washington, he is perhaps the most important opinion maker in the United States. He seems to be able to make many of the opinions of President Roosevelt.

*Life* in a recent lively description of Prof. Tugwell by Drew Pearsons said this:

"No man in the New Deal today yields so much indirect power, commands so much newsprint, sits so near the top of the heap save the New Dealer himself. . . . His remedy is national, planning not through dictatorial decree, but by evolutionary experimentation. Tugwell remains the only member of the original Brain Trust, still active, still forceful, still near the throne."

In that much talked of book "The New Dealers," interestingly describing in a friendly spirit the chief personalities of Mr. Roosevelt's Administration, Mr. Tugwell is referred to as "its principal economic philosopher," and further we are told "When you reach Tugwell you come close to the heart of the New Deal."

It is intimated in this seemingly inspired story of the New Dealers that to Tugwell, rather than to his chief Secretary Wallace, is due the application of a "planned economy" for the American farmer by the process of subsidizing him with public funds to limit the produce of his land. This process is called "social control." Perhaps it was the hurt pride of authorship that led the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in a radio address not long ago, to be so angered with critics of the AAA as to refer to them as "Tory obscurantists," and to their criticism as "infantile, obscene, and wicked."

I wish there were space for me to deal with a few samples of Dr. Tugwell's opinions on economic subjects, which, if I could quote them, might leave the reader of ordinary intelligence like myself in a maze of confusion and obfuscation. Those readers who were wise enough to keep a file of *LAND AND FREEDOM* may remember (May-June, 1933 issue), the devastating exposure of Dr. Tugwell's mental processes made in an extended review by Joseph Dana Miller of "The Industrial Discipline and Governmental Arts," a much advertised book of last year. Although very courteously performed, Mr. Miller's revela-

tion in that review of the vague, superficial and confused thinking of the professor, must to those who read it, have seemed entirely conclusive. My own reading of some of the essays of Dr. Tugwell leaves me without understanding why this gentleman has attained the eminence and influence that is his in the affairs of the nation.

So far as one may be able to discover any guiding economic principle of importance that Dr. Tugwell seeks to follow and to impress upon the people of the United States, it is the Socialist concept of "a planned economy," to be attained by experimentation. Mark Sullivan truly observes in a recent article that a planned economy is a dictated economy and that dictation in the end can only make itself felt by imposing jail imprisonment or economic ruin upon those who will not submit to it.

It was with Tugwell in his eye, perhaps, that Al Smith (before he was induced to retire from editorship and become a good boy), said something to the effect that experiment was being substituted for experience in the seat of government. And the *Sphere* only recently said, referring directly to Dr. Tugwell:

"It is a pity of course, that the experimental ground for academic enthusiasm should have been or is the nation's economy."

This is enough about Dr. Tugwell.

The next time I write, I would like to say things about the opinions and the influence of Lippman and Brown, each of whom, through wide syndication of their writings, has an immense audience.—JOHN COLLINS.

## Exchange

MANY people seem to think that the exchange payable when money is sent from one country to another, is a burden placed on the operation by banks and financiers for their own profit. Exchange would exist and rise and fall if there were no banks and financiers, though no doubt those agencies speculate in exchange and sometimes win and sometimes lose. Suppose Brown in Australia has a profitable milk run, and saves £1,000 which he wants to send to America for a piano and a motor car. He cannot send Australian money, so he goes to Smith who has wool or butter and asks him to sell him enough of those products to enable him to get the American goods he desires. Smith knows how much Australian money he will get in exchange for the bank draught he receives when his wool or butter is sold in London or New York, and he will charge Brown accordingly. If Smith says "Glad to oblige you, old chap, I don't want any profit," that is the lowest rate of exchange possible. But if there are dozens of people who want to import goods but have no Australian goods to export, and are all approaching Smith for accommodation, exchange will naturally rise. The higher it rises the better for exporters, and the more the Browns will

have to pay. But this does not necessarily mean that the Smiths will be better off than the Browns or that it would be more profitable for them to give up their milk run and go in for producing butter or wool; though rising exchange will always be one factor in encouraging people to produce exportable goods. The only way to reduce the rate of exchange is to produce plenty of exportable goods. A general attempt to do so will surely be met by a rise in the price of land on which the exportable goods must be produced, also tariffs on machinery and stores used in the production of the exportable goods will, by enhancing the cost of their production, increase the difficulty of placing them on the market of the world.

It must be noted that although Brown does his business through a bank, the effect is the same, and he does it in that way because the bank charge is less than the bother of hunting up a Smith and dealing with him.

E. I. S. H.

## Miscellany

### TAXPAYERS MUST GIVE HARDOONS \$337,720 FOR ONE-SIXTH-ACRE

The decision of the land commission of the Municipal Council to give Mrs. Liza Hardoon the sum of Tls. 337,720, equivalent to about \$130,000 in U. S. currency for slightly over one-sixth of an acre of land on Nanking Road for street-widening purposes strictly with the principles of Anglo-Saxon law with respect to the acquisition of private land for public purposes. But even though it accords with legal principles there will be many foreigners and Chinese, land owners as well as non-land owners, who will not relish the idea of digging down into their pockets in these difficult times to pay their portion of this considerable sum of money. According to the evidence brought out at the hearing, S. A. Hardoon purchased the property in 1919 at a rate of approximately Tls. 60,000 for one-sixth of an acre, amounting to about \$80,000 in U. S. currency, according to the high silver exchange rate prevailing at that time.

S. A. Hardoon came to Shanghai many years ago by the Bagdad-Indian route and every dollar he acquired in real estate transactions he invested in Nanking Road property—to such an extent that he became the largest owner of frontage on both sides of Shanghai's chief retail street. The buildings he constructed were jerry-built of cheap mud-bricks and plaster, often of such inferior materials that sections frequently fell into the street, endangering the safety of pedestrians. Under the antiquated system of taxation that prevails in Shanghai, the shop-keepers who rented the buildings had to pay the taxes. Therefore, all Landlord Hardoon had to do was sit back and collect his rent, which he steadily increased as the leases expired. Hardoon spent little or nothing to improve his property and if a tenant required a new front window or other improvement, the tenant had to spend the money himself. As Shanghai grew and the crowds became denser and denser on Nanking Road, Hardoon became richer and richer, until at the time of his death a few years ago he was worth well over \$50,000,000. All of his wealth went to his widow, a woman of Chinese nationality, who lives in seclusion in the large estate surrounded by a high brick wall on Bubbling Well Road. Soon after his death several relatives from the protectorate of Iraq turned up in Shanghai to claim a portion of the estate, but the British court refused to entertain their claims. When Hardoon died he was land-poor, meaning that there were no liquid assets available to pay the British inheritance tax, in consequence of which it became necessary for the estate to float a bond issue to pay the taxes.

For many years Hardoon constituted the largest single handicap

to the improvement of what should have become one of the best retail streets in the world, comparable at least to the Ginza in Toyko. His refusal to improve his property resulted in Nanking Road being a street of cheap, insanitary shacks, many of them unsuited for occupancy and unfit for human habitation. Today, owing to the economic depression and the falling off of tourist trade, few of the retailers on Nanking Road are able to sell sufficient merchandise to pay their rents, but there has been no tendency to reduce rentals. Hardoon contributed little to charity throughout his long career, and while he received the best possible protection under British extraterritorial jurisdiction he paid no taxes to the British treasury, at least not until after he was dead, and since his property was located within the Foreign Settlement he likewise paid no taxes to the Chinese Government. The attorneys for the Hardoon estate, in the recent hearing demanded \$564,108.97 for the narrow strip of property which the city required for widening the street. The award of Tls. 337,720 which the estate received accords strictly with accepted legal conceptions, but as stated in the foregoing, the decision of the land commission will bring little joy to Shanghai's now sorely-harassed taxpayers.

*China Weekly Review.*

### HOW WE STRANGLE TRADE

On Thursday, before the millionth bale left the port on a departing steamer, Houston had exported 989,566 bales of cotton this season. At the same time last year exports totaled 1,989,001 bales. The port was reaching the second million in exports instead of the first.

It is not difficult to understand what this terrific loss in tonnage means to the port. It does not require a statistician to compute the slump in employment resulting from loss of markets for a million bales of cotton in a single year or the monetary losses involved.

The loss of more than half of our cotton export business is the most serious problem confronting Houston as a port. This threat to an industry which has a huge investment in this city and provides employment for literally thousands of persons is serious enough to challenge the interest of every Houstonian.—*Houston Post.*

### FRANCE AND BELGIUM

*Terre et Liberte* (18 Ave. de la Criolla, Suresnes, Seine, and 7 Ave. Wolvendael, Uccle-les-Bruxelles) for January-March, 1935, is largely a "Spanish" number. Much care is given to study of the Socialist land laws, which were a large factor in the anti-Socialist reaction of today, including as they did many proposals of which Georgists could not approve. A table shows that of five millions of agriculturists there are two millions of paupers or proletarians with no land; and a quarter million poor peasants with an average holding of one acre; one million small owners with an average of twelve acres; 700,000 more comfortable with an average of fifty acres; while 50,000 large owners have more than 1,200 acres, of whom the really important are a mere handful. One per cent of the population "own" fifty-one per cent of the country; while there are in the Estremadura alone 35,000 "Junteros," idle, "capitalist laborers," with a plough team of their own, offering to work land on shares. The plans to buy estates above a certain *area* (often below a standard of cultivation) and let them in small equal holdings to unemployed are very costly and unlikely to give any lasting result—certainly as compared with transfer of tax burdens to site value as demanded by an increasing number of civic bodies. The review also contains an incisive article by Mr. Sam Meyer on "Planning and Liberty" and a comparison of the Land Laws of Solon with the proposals of Henry George by Mr. P. Gianellia.—M. J. S. in London *Land and Liberty.*

### CHILE MOVES IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Some fifty years ago, while employed as a gas inspector for his city, Henry George wrote his brilliant book, "Progress and Poverty." His contention was a single tax on land exclusively would be a panacea

for the economic ills of society. His theory caused an intellectual furor. Big business was forced to try and answer it with a book called "Progress and Prosperity."

Perhaps the only place where his theory is even being partially applied today is in Pittsburgh, the home of the rich Mellon family. That city's first Democratic mayor in twenty years, William N. McNair, is a George disciple. Under his administration there is a higher tax on land than on its improvements.

Seemingly Chile is applying his theory. But the facts are otherwise. That country has adopted a law that all new buildings erected during the four years ending December 31 next will be exempted from all taxation for ten years.

The measure is to give relief to thousands of idle men and business houses, thus restoring prosperity. This objective has been attained.

Thousands of homes, stores and business blocks have been constructed all over the country. Millions of dollars have been distributed in buying building material and paying wages. The banks co-operated by making loans at a low interest rate.

—SAM EWING, columnist in *San Francisco News*.

### KIDDING THEMSELVES

A Stockton man was heard the other day to say that he does not care how many taxes are piled on his business, providing he can pass them along to the customer.

Men who talk like this are just "kidding themselves."

Taxes that are passed on always bound back!

Business has to be produced. It does not produce itself.

Unless men are producing, there is no business; and there can be business only in proportion to our production.

Men who talk as this man does are forgetting that the money that goes for taxes does not produce.

The men employed as assessors, tax-collectors, tax auditors, tax investigators, tax spies and spies spying on all these are not producing!

At that time, energy, money and ability is lost from production.

This is so because taxation does not produce—it must, instead, be assumed as so much added dead load, so much more friction, so much lost motion.

Business men should look upon a tax, even one that can be passed on to the customer, as a direct loss.

No one makes anything collecting taxes for a government; for, even if it were always collected, and even if it cost nothing to keep books and remit the taxes to the authorities, the business man makes nothing by this labor.

Often he is out money by failure or inability to collect.

And, in any event, the buying power of his customers is reduced in exact proportion to the taxes they pay.

The gasoline tax averages over forty per cent of the price of the gasoline. This tax of forty per cent means that the buying power of automobilists is cut down forty per cent. If automobilists can not or will not economize on mileage, their purchasing power in other fields is cut down accordingly. In that case they buy fewer clothes or spend less with the grocer—or let the doctor or the lawyer or the dentist take that loss.—*The Forum*, Stockton, Calif.

### ONE MAN'S OPINION

Here is something that I have had in mind for years. Indeed, I mentioned the idea variously in several connections through the last decade. Brother economist writes in part:

"I believe that we Henry George fellows should all migrate to some one State and there try to enact and establish those economic principles and proposals of freedom and justice which we advocate by our own majority there.

"Let the Socialists and Communists—those Marx-maddened minions—go to any State by themselves as a majority there also; then let the rightness of our Henry George philosophy be demon-

strated by results. Then the exact science of economic principles would be shown as a fact and that would be of inestimable value. Yours for justice, Waldo J. Wernicke, Los Angeles."

—Editorial *Los Angeles Post Record*.

### A THOUGHTFUL COMMENT

A mode of thinking that regards the very structure of society as a wicked or vicious contrivance put together and maintained by the malevolence of nature or the wickedness of certain selfish men and fails to take into account the long development of society, leading to its present organic structure, cannot be expected to discover the nature of its present maladjustments or to promote effective means for the setting right of its present functional derangements.

I believe that our social organization, like our individual bodies, is endowed by its long inheritance with a marvellous and beautiful organic structure that is fully capable, so far as structure is concerned, of performing every function of which the organism as a whole has need, and, again, like the individual body, it is subject to functional disorders which put its various parts in great need of readjustment one to another and to the whole, rather than any destruction or general reconstruction. With readjustments, the evolution and organic growth of society will continue, but this can be only by the method which nature employs in all those forms or organization which survive, and that is not by discarding existing structures and forms, but by combining them into ever higher and more complex relationships out of which new functions and new attainments emerge. This is known as Emergent Evolution. It is perhaps the deepest conception and the most significant intellectual development of the present age.—SPENCER HEATH.

### OF WHOM DOES THIS REMIND YOU?

Both brilliant and brittle, both bold and unstable,  
Indecisive, yet keen, Alfred Vargrave seemed able  
To dazzle but not to illumine mankind.  
A vigorous, various, versatile mind;  
A character wavering, fitful, uncertain,  
Like a shadow that shakes o'er a luminous curtain—  
Vague, flitting, but on it forever impressing  
The shape of some substance at which you stand guessing.  
When you said: "All is worthless and weak here," behold  
Into sight on a sudden there seemed to unfold  
Great outlines of strenuous truth in the man.  
When you said "This is genius," the outlines grew wan,  
And his life, though in all things so gifted and skilled,  
Was at best but a promise which nothing fulfilled.

—From OWEN MEREDITH'S "Lucile."

### SINGLE TAXERS' SHOWING AT TRENTON

Ever since George L. Record's days the Legislature, almost every year, has been asked to act on a bill that would, if enacted into law, carry out gradually the Henry George Single Tax idea by providing for the gradual shifting of the tax from homes and buildings and improvements on the land.

Each time the bill has been beaten more or less decisively. This week the proposal, sponsored by Assemblymen Fred Von Nieda of Camden, Republican, and Theron McCampbell of Monmouth, Democrat, was given 21 votes to 37 cast in opposition.

The bulk of the favorable vote came from Essex, whose representatives so voted largely as a compliment to Alfred Chandler of Newark, one of the chief apostles of the Henry George doctrine. There was also the influence of William H. Seely, chairman of the Essex Clean Government League, who is a Single Taxer and holds that the taxes ought to be levied on the land and not on the handiwork of man.

The late Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, former Senator Charles



O'Connor Hennessy, formerly of Bergen, former Assemblyman James G. Blauvelt of Ridgewood, the late Supreme Court Justice James F. Minturn, Frank Sommer, Republican State Commitman Everett Colby, Charles Ingersoll, former Mayor Mark M. Fagan and J. Owen Grundy have all been classed as advocates of the Henry George doctrine, but as a rule this doctrine is not much on parade except at banquets to the memory of Henry George or on other occasions where the job of translating words into action is not directly involved.

The vote for the Henry George bill this week in Trenton was larger than had been anticipated. At a time when land is bearing such a heavy tax burden it was feared by the Single Taxers that few assemblymen would care to vote for a proposal to shift taxes from buildings to the land, especially if the members were not fully versed in all phases of the Henry George gospel.—*Jersey Journal*, June 28.

### UNEARNED INCOMES

In an off-hand, impromptu fashion, privilege may be defined as the legally protected right to a flow of income and benefits from legally recognized and protected property rights. Privileges may be earned, such as the income derived from funds which the recipient himself has earned and saved; privileges often are entirely unearned, such as the income derived from inheritances of a vast nature, unearned income in site value in city land (community created wealth) or natural resources. Nature gave man a great abundance of natural resources free and man has been attempting to correct that oversight ever since by charging mankind plenty for these useful, indispensable natural resources. Unearned income derived from inheritance, natural resources, site value, and other unearned sources, as monopoly franchises, may be regarded as unearned privileges divorced from the performance of necessary economic functions. Abraham Lincoln once defined the parasitic privileged class as those who live by owning rather than by doing.

PROF. JOSEPH M. KLAMON in *St. Louis Star-Times*.

### TIME TO CHANGE OUR POLICY

No specious reasoning or trick logic can alter the obvious and indisputable facts. There is something vital and significant to be found in the unanimity of agreement among all recognized authorities in the realm of political economy, to the effect that any tax levied upon the products of industry inevitably sifts down to the backs of the industrious, where it adds to an already too burdensome load.

The tax condition has become a serious one. This is not more true in one State than another, though there are variations in the kinds of taxes levied and the methods of collecting them. Evidently the same general errors are being made everywhere and the results are uniformly unfortunate. Why not then turn away from the common practices which have proven themselves so ill-advised, have produced such tragic results and give no promise whatever of doing better in the future? Even those in high places who feel impelled to say that perhaps we must, after all, have a sales tax of some sort, do so with apparent reluctance and with the accompanying denial of any sympathy with the principle of the tax.

Must we have more of the sort of taxes which have proven so disastrous and inequitable? If we wish to destroy commerce and industry altogether it can be done with taxation, unless the people, the service-rendering manufacturers and merchants and their cooperating employes demand in no uncertain terms the full enjoyment of their right to freely render their good services without being hampered or their legitimate interests impaired by a sales tax.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY in *West Coast Trade Journal*.

### LAND IS FOR USE NOT SPECULATION

If the people of Cordele want to improve living conditions in this republic they should bestir themselves.

Prosperity has been "just around the corner" since the days of

Hoover and we don't yet know which corner or what way it is going or if it is going at all.

And even if we got it who wants a partial make-believe thing like what we called prosperity?

What we had was not secure and was for a few only. Why not have a civilization in which all can prosper?

Unless you do it is a pseudo or false civilization or prosperity. So far as I know the present authorities of Cordele are doing as well with the means at hand as any one else could do, but I think we should change our plans.

This town could have an immense influence and when and if joined by some more could accomplish wonders.

The main thing we need to learn is to use the land instead of speculating in it. To stop the private appropriation of the rental values and use them for the public good.

When you do that we could have some worth-while improvements not now attainable and also get relief from all kinds of taxation.

To mention only one of a long list of benefits our merchants could and would carry larger and better stocks of goods and sell them cheaper if they were relieved of ad valorem taxation on same.

Just about anybody who wanted a home could and would build one.

Do you, Mr. Editor, or any of your readers know the limit of achievement for law and order and science? I do not.

HOWELL CLOPTON HARRIS, in *Cordele*, (Ga.) *News*.

### WAIL OF A PROTECTED MANUFACTURER

I am a manufacturer, and was a petitioner for the act to encourage and protect the manufacturers of this State. I was very happy when the act was obtained, and I immediately added to the price of my manufacturers as much as it would bear, so as to be a little cheaper than the same articles imported in paying the duty. By this addition I hoped to grow richer. But, as every manufacturer whose wares are under Protection has done the same, I begin to doubt whether, considering the whole year's experiences of my family, with all these separate additions which I pay to other manufacturers, I am at all a gainer. And I confess I cannot but wish that, except the Protection duty on my own manufacture, all duties of the kind were taken off and abolished.—BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

### NO RADICAL

One of the ironies of life is how Henry George is regarded as a radical, and how when Single Taxers are mentioned in modern times the hearer inevitably brackets them with Socialists.

The day may come, what with share-the-wealth taxing programmes, and soak the rich schemes, and nationalization of banking ideas, and the public ownership of utilities, when the forces of capitalism will need a real defender against the assaults of collectivism, and Henry George, if he hadn't fallen into disrepute, would have been that defender.

For never in the history of economic writing has such an iron-bound unbreakable, absolutely complete and untouchable defense of the rights and the real necessity of capitalism been written as George provided in his great work, "Progress and Poverty."

Never has a champion of individual freedom, of rugged individualism, of the right of every man to the product of his own toil, the right of every man to rule his destiny as he sees fit, spoken so clearly and emphatically.

George's particular antipathy was monopoly, and his thesis was that monopoly was impossible save where someone obtained control of a natural agent of production—a natural agent being some object which man could not duplicate with his own toil, such as land, water power, mines, and so on.

He was violently opposed to any tax whatever on industry, on the improvements which men made to lands, on buildings, on income. He asked only that men pay for the use of natural agents the proper

or social value of those natural agents; and he contended if that were done not only would the legitimate expenses of government be met, but there would be no need of such regulatory devices as NRA and, the rest of the alphabetical soup; depressions would be less serious, for there would be no misery and unemployment, and capitalism could go on in its function of increasing the divisible supply of wealth to infinity, for it would always have a market. There would be nothing taken out of production for taxes, consequently the buying power of the public would be infinitely increased.

Capitalists, however, who want in these days of doubt and distrust to justify their position in a logically unassailable manner, who want the classic defenses of interest and profits, should read George.

Editorial *Daily Idaho Statesman*, Boise, Idaho.

#### THE REDUCTION TO SLAVERY

In seeking to deny them the right to sell timber from land purchased from the State until the land is paid for in full, it would seem that the governor and attorney general are not so much concerned with stopping land speculation as they are in reducing the purchasers of State land to a basis of slavery by making it impossible to use the land as best suits their purposes.

In this connection it will be recalled that last year the governor and attorney general, as members of the State Land Commission, would have disposed of the price of leases in Mississippi, at a mere fraction of its value to Uncle Andy Mellon's company, which owns millions of acres in Mississippi, had not R. D. Moore, State Land Commissioner, and third member of the land commission, refused to consent to such outrageous transaction.

*Jeffersonian Democrat*, Jackson, Miss.

#### KARL B. MICKEY SPANKS THE CLEVELAND PRESS

To the Editor:

In your editorial on the President's tax message you conclude with the assertion that "with the general philosophy set forth there can be, in our opinion, little for any fair-minded citizen to challenge." It seems to me a new idea of fairness, to impute in advance unfairness to anyone so brash as to disagree with you. Despite my natural trepidation under the circumstances, I shall brave the imputation.

To avoid the charge of misrepresenting the President, I shall in each case set down the verbatim quotation from the address before my comment on it.

"The movement toward progressive taxation of wealth and of income has accompanied the growing diversification and inter-relationship of effort which marks our industrial society."

In other words, as the arts of production and exchange have improved, government has tried to discourage the improvement by progressively fining the improvers.

"Wealth in the modern world does not come merely from individual effort; it results from a combination of individual effort and of the manifold uses to which the community puts that effort."

Mr. Roosevelt ought to tell us what he means by "wealth;" he doesn't use it in the sense of any coherent definition I have ever run across. Wealth, as defined by reputable economists, is, and must be, the product of the individual; and that fact is not altered by co-operation, voluntary or involuntary, between individuals. What he means by "a combination of individual effort and of the manifold uses to which the community puts that effort," stumps me entirely.

"In the last analysis such accumulations (of wealth) amount to the perpetuation of great and undesirable concentration of control in a relatively few individuals over the employment and welfare of many, many others."

How in the name of common sense can wealth perpetuate concentration of control? Wealth can't even perpetuate itself. Wealth is the most transient, ephemeral thing in the world. It is continuously being diminished by deterioration, rust, decay, and obsolescence. In the form of consumption goods it is constantly being destroyed by consumption; in the form of capital goods, by use. Something en-

tirely different gives the few the power of economic tyranny over the many; something which Mr. Roosevelt mentions in a later paragraph.

"A tax upon inherited wealth is a tax upon static wealth, not upon that dynamic wealth which makes for the healthy diffusion of economic good."

I quote this sentence for comic relief. I can imagine no more splitting spectacle than that of Mr. Roosevelt attempting to define what he means by "static wealth" and "dynamic wealth."

"People know that vast personal incomes come not only through the effort or ability or luck of those who receive them, but also because of the opportunities for advantage which Government itself contributes."

Now the cat is out of the bag. The power of economic tyranny is never due to productive effort and the possession of wealth, but always to opportunities for advantage which Government sets up by legislative enactment to rob the people of their heritage. In other words, the economic bondage of the people is not due to wealth, but to the malfeasance of their own Government.

Isn't the remedy, then, to stamp out the unjust advantage which Government gives to a few men over their fellows? How can the President talk of "social justice" while complacently permitting the existence of this condition to go unchallenged? If Mr. Roosevelt sincerely wishes to kill this evil, he will ask Congress to abolish governmental interference with equality of economic opportunity, instead of indiscriminately to tax wealth regardless of whether it is legitimately or illegitimately acquired. He will strike at the root, instead of hacking at the branches.

I submit this for publication on the assumption that there still is sufficient freedom left to permit a humble subject to utter a word of respectful criticism of his masters.—KARL B. MICKEY.

#### DEBTS MAKE TAXES

Not so long ago a national debt of \$1,000,000,000 was regarded as being dangerous. Today we are asked to look with equanimity on a debt of \$35,000,000,000.

Nobody knows where the money is coming from. Nobody has been told. We all know that payment must be made some time or other out of taxes. Taxes today are estimated to be twenty-five per cent of the national income. If increased incomes come with prosperity, such increased incomes will be of no benefit to the people—the increase will be eaten up in added taxes.

What incentive is there to increased business if every citizen knows that the reward for his effort will be taken away from him? Unless taxes go down there can be no sound prosperity. If they do go down, prosperity will come of its own accord.—*Public Service Magazine*.

#### NEW DEAL AND OLD DEAL POLICIES

Mr. Ogden L. Mills is the greatest opponent of New Deal fallacies and the greatest exponent of old deal fallacies. His statement "that employees' share of the national income had increased steadily until the depression began in 1929" must be examined not only as to the total amount paid employees but rather the relation of the increased amount of wages paid to the increased amount of wealth produced. Also bearing in mind that a wage is what a wage will buy.

Mr. Mills claims the World War was "the fundamental cause of the depression." The war may have hastened it, or contributed to its depth of duration. Monopoly of the natural resources and speculation in securities, the values of which are based on the natural resources, cause all booms, panics and depressions.

JOHN J. EGAN in *World-Telegrams*.

#### POLITICAL SCIENCE

Politics is the science of equity, and treats of the relations of men in equity. It professes to develop the laws by which human actions ought to be regulated, in so far as men interfere with each other.

In position it is posterior to political economy and anterior to re-

ligion. Its principal substances are Man, Will, Action, Duty, Crime, Rights, Wrongs, and Property; and the general problem is to discover the laws which should regulate the voluntary actions of men towards each other, and thereby determine what the order of society in its practical construction and arrangement ought to be. \* \* \* And as there cannot be the slightest doubt that God has made truth the fountain of good, it may perhaps be fairly expected that, if ever political science is fairly evolved and really reduced to practice, it will confer a greater benefit on mankind and prevent a greater amount of evil than all the other sciences."—From "The Theory of Human Progression," by PATRICK EDWARD DOVE.

#### WHAT GOVERNMENT COSTS US

Expenditures of government from Washington to Wilson, 1789-1913, total of 124 years—\$24,521,845,000.

Expenditures of Roosevelt administration as estimated by the President—actual 1934 and estimated 1935 and 1936, total of three years—\$24,206,533,000.

*Wingold News Letter*, Bay State Milling Co., Winona, Minn.

**N**OW, however, we are coming into collision with facts which there can be no mistaking. From all parts of the civilized world come complaints of industrial depression; of labor condemned to involuntary idleness; of capital massed and wasting; of pecuniary distress among business men; of want and suffering and anxiety among the working classes. All the dull, deadening pain, all the keen, maddening anguish, that to great masses of men are involved in the words "hard times," afflict the world today.—"PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

**T**HE Irish famine was not a true famine arising from scarcity of food. It was what an English writer styled the Indian famine—a "financial famine," arising not from scarcity of food but from the poverty of the people.—"THE LAND QUESTION."

**T**HOSE who say it would be unjust for the people to resume their natural rights in the land without compensating present holders, confound right and wrong as flagrantly as did they who held it a crime in the slave to run away without first paying his owner his market value.—"PROPERTY IN LAND."

**O**NE thing or the other must be true—either protection does give better opportunities to labor and raises wages, or it does not. If it does, we who feel that labor has not its rightful opportunities and does not get its fair wages should know it, that we may unite, not merely in sustaining present protection, but in demanding far more. If it does not, then, even if not positively harmful to the working classes, protection is a delusion and a snare, which distracts attention and divides strength, and the quicker it is seen that tariffs cannot raise wages the quicker are those who wish to raise wages likely to find out what can. The next thing to knowing how anything can be done, is to know how it cannot be done.—"PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE."

**F**OR it is of the very nature of injustice that it really profits no one. When and where was slavery good for slaveholders? Did her cruelties in America, her expulsions of Moors and Jews, her burnings of heretics, profit Spain? Has England gained by her injustice toward Ireland? Did not the curse of an unjust social system rest on Louis XIV and Louis XV as well as on the poorest peasant whom it condemned to rags and starvation—as well as on that Louis whom it sent to the block? Is the Czar of Russia to be envied?—"THE LAND QUESTION."

**T**HERE is distress where large standing armies are maintained, but there is also distress where the standing armies are nominal; there is distress where protective tariffs stupidly and wastefully hamper trade, but there is also distress where trade is nearly free;

there is distress where autocratic government yet prevails, but there is also distress where political power is wholly in the hands of the people in countries where paper is money, and in countries where gold and silver are the only currency. Evidently, beneath all such things as these, we must infer a common cause.—"PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

## BOOK REVIEWS

### THE STAGNATION OF INDUSTRY ITS CAUSE AND CURE

EMIL O. JORGENSEN

**A**NY reader of this courageous book who accepts the fundamentals of George's teaching fully is likely to be completely bewildered by the first three chapters, but will experience an intense satisfaction from there on to the very end.

In the first three chapters the discussion of Rent and Price is such as to make this reviewer doubtful as to whether the subject matter can ever possibly be made entirely clear to anyone who does not accept the assumption that "rent enters into price." In the effort to add something constructive to this discussion, the chapter beginning with the fourth will be considered first and the Rent and Price question later.

In Chapter IV, the author comes into perfect agreement with George on "The Remedy." In it he deals with rent as a "socially created value" in a manner that may leave the thoughtful reader wondering how the proposition concerning Rent and Price set up earlier, ever came about. The justifications for the remedy (the Single Tax) are admirably set forth. The wastefulness of the rent-receiving class is emphasized in a way that leaves nothing to be desired. It is a fine point, forcefully stated.

"Incidental effects of the remedy" are presented in a manner that shows what the author can do when he is on firm ground.

"Civilization at the crossroads" is a picture that should be placed before all men in high place in the vague hope that they could be made to realize the dark problems they face.

In Part II, "The Application of the Single Tax," the author gives his opinion of "how and where to begin." Perhaps this is correct for Chicago, to which it refers, but will remain a matter of opinion as to other places.

Part III really supplements the benevolent effects of the remedy, previously referred to, under the caption, "The Benefits of the Proposed Bills," as applied to bills discussed in Part II for Chicago. All the subject matter is splendidly described and applies equally well everywhere. Most of those familiar with their George are naturally well acquainted with this content but it has rarely been presented so interestingly, accompanied by charts, tables and graphs, for which all who are interested in elucidating George's views will undoubtedly be grateful to the author's industry. For carrying conviction to the popular mind, these passages can not be praised too highly.

Appreciation and description of the above must be curtailed, however, in view of the limited space and importance of the subject, while the first three chapters which deal with Rent and Price are considered. Here is attempted a serious breach in the defenses of the whole George philosophy. Concede that George did not understand "Rent" in all of its ramifications and it at once appears that thousands of serious-minded thinkers wasted their time and, what is worse, their enthusiasm for making this world happier for the human race. If George's understanding and reasoning are incorrect how can the "Remedy" based on his diagnosis effect a cure?

In connection with this disagreement about rent entering or not into price, why has not the author, who is now repeating what he has said before, taken advantage of his opportunity to answer his critics? In the Sept.-Oct., 1931 issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, the late Oscar H. Geiger reviewed "The Road to Better Business and Plentiful Employment" by the same author. Mr. Geiger, whose qualifications for such discussion none dispute, laid out some funda-

mental facts and deductions therefrom which certainly merited serious consideration. The same is true of Mr. E. I. S. Hardinge in *LAND AND FREEDOM* of March-April, 1932. Anyone who has read both the books here considered and the trenchant articles mentioned, will not find a definite answer in this book to these distinguished critics or any evidence that the facts and reasoning therefrom have colored the author's thought. Why?

Another broad question that naturally arises is, how does the author arrive at exactly the same remedy and the effects of the remedy after taking a completely opposite view of the functioning of the basic factor in George's whole structure—Rent? It must be borne in mind that any consideration of Rent in production and distribution also involves wages and interest as inter-related factors. Thus, a fundamental distortion of one necessarily involves the other two factors. Further, the author knows that Rent will still be in existence even when collected by the Government so that, as far as Rent goes, the economic situation will be the same.

Here is seen a basic error in the analyses as given in the book—a serious one, too, since it is responsible for much confusion of thought as presented in the effort to show Rent as increasing the price at which commodities will be sold. Careful consideration of the presentation of the author's procedure in his attempt to prove his case indicates three exceedingly serious faults and in a matter which challenges the philosophy of so great a thinker as George and doing so on a principle which is one of the few that George is in entire agreement with his opponents, more is demanded than a loose discourse. Even if only incidental, the question of Rent and Price should have been adequately treated.

The greatest fault in the author's method is that of attempting to treat things separately which are, by their nature, inseparable. Next, the author gives us very incomplete statements of the problems he uses. Also, there are assumptions that are not proven at all. The reader of this review will note examples of these as they are given. Minor errors will be quite obvious as attention is called to them.

Early in the preface this statement is encountered: "The lack of purchasing power springs not, as is commonly supposed, from lowness of wages" but "from the highness of the prices the consumers must pay." Right here, this initial failure to regard low wages and high prices as one and the same things touches off a whole train of confused thought. The fact that an exchange of labors is at the bottom of all production and consumption, is ignored. Real wages—the things labor consumes—are ignored and we find the economic term "wages" involved determinedly with the monetary term "prices," although money is nothing but a medium of exchange. With this kind of start the argument is bound to grow more confused, and it does.

In a minute this follows: that George was plunged into a "sea of errors" by his "innocent acceptance" of Ricardo's law of rent which "forced him to begin his exposition from the most difficult end—that is, from the angle of the producer instead of the angle of the consumer." As a matter of fact, George was not forced as stated, but treated consumption as the end of production and so treated both "ends" as they should be. He did not stop with "price" of commodities at the point of exchange until he discussed exchange as a step from production to consumption. George traced production from the land to the consumer and from the consumer back to land so comprehensively, that it is difficult to account for the quoted statement at all.

The preface declares that George was plunged into the "absurdity" that "the benefits of labor-saving machinery are passed on to consumers in lower prices" and "are absorbed by landholders in higher rents—both at the same time." The author lays this "absurdity" to George's belief, taken from Ricardo, that Rent does not enter into Price. The fact that the social value of the opportunity to use machines in society could be absorbed by the owners of land

while the effectiveness of the machine in reducing the costs of production would reduce prices of commodities, is entirely unexplored! This lack of understanding of what Rent actually is keeps cropping up right along in the discussions with confusing uses of other terms—wages being the most important ambiguity.

Going to the body of the book in the first chapter dealing with the problem, we find Dr. Butler, the President of Columbia University and Ramsay MacDonald quoted and indicated as in "perplexity and confusion" about the "stoppage of industry," etc. After asking "why," the author is "convinced" that "the icy grip which the dead hand of an ancient political economy holds over the minds of men is responsible for the bewilderment."

As propoganda this is probably effective, but what these prominent men say publicly in order to guide the people has little to do with political economy, and no one who understands George is "bewildered" by the stoppage of industry. They know the cause.

"Why men work" is most interestingly written for popular minds, and if it were not for the fact that it is part of the set-up which is to lead to the conclusion that Rent increases prices, it would not need to be discussed. (Note: Although the author does not definitely say too often that Rent "increases" prices, the text is entirely occupied in attempting to prove that assumption).

Most students are satisfied with the dictum that men seek to satisfy their desires with the least possible effort, but the activities of Robinson Crusoe are chronicled for some pages before that dictum is finally reached. Inasmuch as there was no society, it becomes necessary to construct a "society" out of the lonely Crusoe. In this constructive society the conclusion is reached that "men cease work when desire is satisfied." Well! Well! We find that this society contained "no capitalists or landlords"—this notwithstanding that Crusoe's canoe which he constructed to "haul things in" is listed in the accompanying chart—as a "convenience." His "traps" and his "storehouse full" are also mentioned but not classified. Aren't these evidences of capital? Did not undisputed possession of the island constitute Crusoe as at least technically a landowner?

All of Crusoe's activities are most entertaining, but it would seem the only conclusive knowledge that can be learned from the study would be as to how an individual will act in a certain environment, when absolutely free. True, the narrative states that when Crusoe had enough he threw himself into unemployment, but it is not stated that an acknowledged landowner there could have thrown him out of work *before* he had enough!

In passing, it may be well to point out that all this seems to indicate if anything to the point, that "overproduction" is the cause of "the stoppage of industry." Not even "underconsumption" can be admitted as a cause, although earlier pages disparage both of these explanations. This reviewer got into similar cross currents earlier in life in attempts to prove George wrong, and finally found much more satisfaction by following a clear stream rather than flounder in eddies and whirlpools of his own making.

On page 20, the reader will encounter a subhead that may startle him: "Raising of Wages Illogical, Impractical and Unsound." In explaining this, we encounter one of the most confusing passages in the whole discussion. Here we see some peculiar idiosyncrasies. The author does not allow consumer and producer to become united in one person at any time. Neither will he discuss wages under the head of price. Surely, if a demonstration is to be made, it should be made in like terms. Is there any gain in clarity in discussing consumer's functions always in terms of money and producer's rewards in the economic term "wages?"

Again, it is stated "the interest of the consumers centers around the factor of price, whereas the interest of the producers centers around the factor of *income*." This constant use of unlike terms in connected discussion does not add to clarity and the matter is important. Should not the fact that producers exchange their labor for the labor of others wrapped up in commodities begin to clear up

the picture? Why not keep the fact that producers and consumers are the same people to the fore so that the exchange phase of all transactions will not be obscured? There is not time to straighten out all of this tangle either for the reader or author, even if it could be done.

"The heart of the whole question" is stated: "If the raising of wages compelled prices to rise as fast or even faster than wages go up, how, by this method, can the purchasing power of the masses be increased? The answer is, of course, that it can not thus be increased." Here another quite different answer involving the essential benevolence of the application of George's philosophy, is entirely ignored! Is there any reader of George who does not believe that if land were thrown open to labor on every hand on equitable terms, wages would rise? Would not the commodities produced increase the supply, thereby causing the prices of them to fall? Would not both of these effects be "increases in purchasing power"? The author himself in a most clear and graphic fashion, indicates how supply and demand regulates wages right at this point, but somehow never can connect up the wage-earner with the consumer completely. Neither does he show the influence of the margin of cultivation on the levels of wages. (As a matter of fact, if the author mentions the margin of cultivation anywhere, it was overlooked by this reviewer. This in an attack on the accepted function of Rent!)

To conclude this part of the review. The above are some of the evidences of the kind of rhetoric that is used to destroy a fundamental postulate in economics and cause us to disbelieve the findings of some of the world's greatest thinkers on a proposition upon which they are singularly united.

Scattered all through the first three chapters are errors that indicate a lack of grasp of the factors involved. For instance, on page 41 the author states "no subdivision of industry in the early periods" of American history. Again, on page 60, speaking of the value of land, it is stated that improvements of "private or public character" will raise the value of land. Improvements of a "private" character do not increase the value of land. If that were so, land value could be created anywhere by putting an improvement on land—even in the desert! On page 64, discussing the tremendous increases in the value of our natural resources, the author ascribes the increase to the "machines and discoveries of science." It is society's demand for the content of those natural resources that gives natural resources their enormous value. If only one person owned all the machines in the world, but there was no population, what would be the value of the world's resources? On page 65 the author does not regard it as any easier now to have apples in California and oranges in New York than it was before the railroads! Whew!

In several places in the volume, the author places great reliance on figures. This is natural, but when an effort is made to reduce the results of a great revolutionary change involving many opposing tendencies to such figures as can be applied to the single individual after the upheaval, the validity is nil. Such a computation would be impossible with the most elaborate actuarial methods and resources.

If the Government were to divide the 7.3 billions of taxes among the people, it is said (page 73) that it would finally become an addition of \$300 to the purchasing power of a family of five. As far as this single point is concerned, would not the Government's purchasing power be reduced by that same 7.3 billions?

Now we come to the question as to whether Rent increases or is added to price, or not. It must be ascertained, first, what the author contends in the matter of price.

The preface states, "Every new discovery, every invention and labor-saving device has meant, not any cheapening of commodities to the whole people, but simply that much more unearned increment "for the owners of the earth." This is an important declaration. If this can be disproved, the whole case of Rent being added to Price falls to the ground.

One begins to doubt the preparatory statement immediately on reading a very graphic description of a "young man just starting out on the stormy sea of business life" who has somehow possessed himself of a great many commodities, apparently. He starts up in the morning with an "alarm clock" and during the day uses a catalogue of things coming from all parts of the earth which requires two full pages to list, winding up in the evening lying down on a pretty fine mattress and a good pillow. This young man uses "goods of a myriad kinds." There is an equally fascinating description of a young woman who apparently has the wherewithal to possess herself of numerous things for the home, too. These two people are given as samples and seem to have the things generally to be found in millions of American homes. Now, bear in mind, the author has not said a word of how this is all paid for actually, but does mention "money" in the case of the young woman. At any rate, following the young woman we are told that "the prices which the consumers pay are abnormally high." The discussion of this isolated half of the problem continues steadfastly—ignoring the more important half.

For, "How to decrease the price level" we are referred to Chart 3 which is an interesting catalogue of expenses from Producer to Consumer. Rent is included as an expense. There continues an admirable discussion about prices generally, constantly looking for indubitable proof that prices are abnormally high. What labors are used to pay for the commodities are absent.

The first factor that is encountered that can be accepted as increasing prices is found at page 35—taxes. There will be no quarrel with this assumption that taxes do raise prices. It almost seems as if this book should have begun here.

At page 55 the statement about goods being no cheaper now than ever is reiterated but more specifically—than "200 years ago." Up to this point it will be difficult for the reader to understand, if he considers the matter, how the two sample people mentioned, could have possessed themselves of all that long list of commodities in circumstances where the share of labor in what he produces has constantly dwindled to smaller proportions, if the basis of the exchange, prices, had not fallen in spite of the added taxes. If competition among laborers has a tendency to reduce their wages to the lowest level upon which they will consent to produce, how does it happen that the vast majority of their homes are filled with a complete catalogue of the products of labor, if prices of these things have not fallen? What a pity the author did not develop real wages out of all this graphic description,—that what labor consumes is his real wages.

If we glance at Table 1 offered in support of the "prices are no lower" theory, an item sticks out plainly as proof of this if we go by the figure—that is coal. Coal is shown at \$3.85 per ton about 1840 and steadily advances to \$11.00 per ton in 1920 to 1929. The figures are from a U. S. Finance Report of 1893 and later additions. Surely, here is proof that prices have not fallen. But is it because Rent is added to Price? Previously the author informed us the value of coal land has enormously increased during the very period that the price of coal has advanced. All this would seem to indicate cause and effect working to prove the author's case. But the actual cause of the rising cost of coal does not show in the table at all! The factor of monopoly is absent. By holding valuable coal lands out of use,—made possible by low taxation—the coal operator is able to limit the supply and thus force to the last limit the public can be made to pay. Moreover, the coal operators could if they desired, notwithstanding the greater volume of currency now used in our exchanges, sell coal at a lower price than is quoted for 1840, when the figures begin, and do it in the face of the enhanced land values involved.

So much for Table I. When Table II is examined, the price of commodities is shown as increasing almost steadily to a peak in 1920—this from 1831. This is a Labor Bureau report. Again beware of figures! It is common knowledge that we use a great deal more currency in making our exchanges than in 1831; consequently, prices

will read higher, by far. The wage level was much lower, quoted in money, and the variety of commodities the laborer could have much less.

The author previously shows that he understands that if a day's work nets \$3.00 and a pair of shoes cost him \$3.00, he is in exactly the same position when receiving \$10.00 for his day and paying \$10.00 for the shoes. For some reason there is no use made of this equation when considering the table, although that it applies is common knowledge.

Again the average price of commodities is shown in 1926 as 100 and in 1929 as 96.5. Not a large drop, but still opposite to the author's theory, because Rents were bounding skyward during the drop in the prices of goods. Further, during the depression, prices of many things have been forced up, while Rents have been tumbling. Certainly, if Rent increases prices, the law is not easily discernible. At any rate as far as references made thus far are concerned, there is no proof that prices have not fallen, but plain inference indicates the contrary. There is no indication in this that Rent increases Prices.

Due to the author's rambling method of presentation, it is necessary, now, to retrace, if we are to collate his views on Production and Consumption. In this connection, the author apparently does not think that production only ends when the product is in the hands of the consumer. The constant tendency to keep producer and consumer apart as if they were different beings, is manifest all through the various threads of his scattered discourse on this. He speaks of the consumer as a "work-giver" apparently unable to see that he is the worker himself.

"We have now traced to their tap roots" the grave economic problems, etc., is the way Chapter III begins, and: first, unemployment is charged to failure to buy enough goods; second, the first is not due to low wages, but to high prices; and, third, landowners are collecting Rent and therefore the Government is forced to levy taxes. Not a mention here of how speculation in land operates to cause unemployment; the fact that low wages and high prices are the same thing is again not suitable apparently for the author's purpose.

The advance of productive power is admirably depicted and is full of useful information. The railroad is given as the "Nation's leading labor-saving device." Ignoring the fact that the railroads through the reduction of the cost (in labor, etc.) make it much easier for all to have commodities, the author is content to point the growth of large fortunes to their owners.

This is immediately followed by the statement that "the pioneers in this wilderness were compelled to labor long and hard for the barest necessities." If that is so, and prices are the medium through which labor is exchanged for commodities, how does the lot of the pioneer and the present possession of the humblest of workers compare? How could the present situation exist if the prices of commodities measured in the labor exchanged for them were not lower?

The arguments other than those mentioned to prove that Rent increases Price are all scattered at random through the chapter. Early in the preface we read that Rent is earned by society itself, and goes to the landowners as an *unearned* income. Now, that postulate may suit the author's theory, but it does not illuminate the question as to what Rent is, and if the exhaustive inquiry conducted by George is to be entirely set at naught, a great deal more must be demanded. It is true Rent is mentioned here to justify the Government in taking it and abolishing taxes, but this incomplete definition is going to cloud the reasoning where Rent is involved all through the discussion. How society can "earn" a labor-saving should be explained fully.

In giving well deserved praise to Adam Smith, we find this attributed to him: he (Smith) after revealing the nature and law of Rent, divided the price of commodities into its three component parts—namely, rent, profit (interest) and wages and Rent is an income the consumer must pay. Assuming that Smith is correctly quoted, if Rent does actually consist in economies in production and distribu-

tion, how can it be figured in dollars and cents unless it is included as a minus quantity?

On page 34 occurs this statement: "this Rent of land is a value created by the public at large—by society itself. It is a product of the whole population." All right, of what does this value consist? We must know that before we put it into anything as definite as a schedule of the costs of production. The cost of production will include only the labors of that group of the population that aid in the production of a particular commodity. Why must a factor involving the "whole population" be added to the costs to the consumer of that particular commodity? If the author is sure of his assertion, he should explain it fully. As a matter of fact, it will be difficult. Prices are competitively fixed based on supply and demand. Rent represents certain *economies* and *advantages* inherent in a given site. How can these in any sense affect prices of goods sold there except to *reduce* them? Well may the author anticipate, as he does, "vigorous disputes" of assertions so loosely thrown together.

We are told that "the price of goods" is "precisely where all the trouble is." If Wages, Interest and Rent make up the costs of production upon which prices are fixed and at the margin of cultivation, Rent is 0, how will the addition of zero *increase* the price? Further, if Wages and interest seek a competitive level along with the price of commodities, how can Rent which constantly mounts as the margin is left, possibly be added to a price that remains on a competitive level with the site where Rent is zero?

It has seemed necessary, in this review, to include much matter that ordinarily could be dispensed with. But, when a writer starts out to upset the whole science of political economy as constructed from Adam Smith down through Henry George, it seems proper to examine his work in detail. That this work, so effectively written in many respects, may be splendid propaganda, does not alter the fact that by exhibiting to the public that the exponents of George can not agree on even his fundamental principles, it is rendered much less effective.

That Rent does *not* increase—does not add to price can be shown in many ways. This reviewer does not believe that the contrary has anywhere been made clear.

Take the description of the effects of "L" roads and Subways in Chicago and New York on the value of land. Splendidly described in the book—but a little deeper probing would have shown they constitute a striking disproof of the author's theory. First, the franchise values of those means of transportation are land values—Rent capitalized. The entire expense of those roads is borne by the fares of those who ride in them. Being a social product, they also increase land values. But, why must the expense of creating those land values be added to the price of the goods sold along those lines when the riders have already paid those expenses in their fares? Is it not an inviolable principle that competition among sellers absolutely compels the elimination of all but necessary costs? If that is so, how could a cost already paid for by the riders in "L's" and Subways possibly be added?

Here is a typical list of expenses and income that illustrates how rent actually reduces price: on the debit side there will be Rent, light heat, power, freight, cartage, costs of goods sold, selling costs and delivery, along with administrative expenses; on the credit side there will be gross sales and other income. The income will be deposited in the bank and checks drawn against the balance to pay the debits. Among those checks will be the Rent check. That settles it—Rent is paid out of the prices received for the goods. What more? Just this; that every other check, with possibly an exception or two, will be very much *smaller* due to that payment of Rent. Light, heat, power, freight, cartage, cost of goods sold, selling costs will all be much lower, thus reducing the costs the consumer, after a fair profit is added, must pay. It is probable that *all* costs are lower. When costs per unit are figured, they are seen to be much lowered where high Rents are paid. Volume of sales comes into the picture reduc-

ing all of the costs even all the way back to the land. How then does Rent increase price?

Again, here is a storekeeper,—his lease runs out and is renewed on a lower basis. Does he immediately reduce prices? Not at all. The prices are governed by the demand and supply for his goods. He has simply found that he was paying rent for an economy in his costs that he didn't get and made his landlord see it. On the other hand, if the demand slackens and he is "loaded up," he will be compelled to reduce his prices while his rent remains the same, while if the demand quickens, he will advance his prices if it appears the supply is inadequate. All this regardless of fluctuation in his Rent.

To make this economy phase clearer, consider a genuine efficiency engineer's services to a factory. He shows the manufacturer how to cut his costs in various ways. His check will be paid out of gross sales, but the economies he has effected will appear in lower list prices or larger discounts.

Society has paved a street. Society paid for the pavement with tax money. The paving of the street increased Rent. Must this increased Rent be added to the price of goods? If so, why when society has already paid for it and will maintain it through its taxes? Must it be paid twice? Once by society and again by the consumer?

Wages seek a level governed by what labor can secure where no Rent is paid; the same is true of interest on Capital, but Rent nowhere finds a level. It is a differential that arises from zero to an almost fabulous peak. To assert that this differential factor Rent must be added to the factors Wages and Interest as a part of the cost of production which must be added to the price exacted from the consumer is to put a mathematical burden on the price-fixer that few could assume.

Actually, if the hair must be split, there are three distinct factors embraced in payments for the use of land. First, there is the enhanced price due to the landowners demanding not what the land is worth today, but what it will be worth at a future time—this is sometimes called Speculative Rent. Then, there is the enhanced price caused by the fact that lands held out of use, force the remainder in use to a higher price—this may be called Monopoly Rent. Speculative Rent will be largely governed by estimates of Interest involved while Monopoly Rents will distribute themselves over lands in use. Both of these "Rents" will be added to price because society has not paid for their creation. Neither Speculative nor Monopoly Rents are actually true Economic Rents, and are only so-called because they are attached to land and are included in payments for its use. Possibly this may account for some of the confusion into which we are inevitably plunged when this subject on Rent and Price is discussed.

If the fact that Rent is an economy in the production and physical distribution of commodities paid for by taxes and cooperative forces of society, is kept in mind, it is seen that Rent actually accompanies a *reduction* in prices and as competition compels the elimination of all but unavoidable costs, Rent can not be successfully added to Price.

However, even with Speculative and Monopoly Rents added to taxes and appearing as factors in prices leading toward bankruptcy, it is quite evident that true Rent usually overcomes the upward tendencies in the prices of commodities which have actually fallen—measured in the amount of labor that must be exchanged for them. Otherwise the mass of people could not possibly possess themselves of what they visibly have while working shorter hours.

A consideration of the chain store almost completely disproves the theory advanced. Prices are uniform in all stores of a single chain regardless of the fact that the Rents paid vary by wide margins.

Another point. Where are low prices of goods generally found—where Rents are high or where they are low? If there is any great difference it indicates that where Rents are high there will be found, in a great city at least, lower prices.

A final thought. Labor itself is in many respects bought and sold as a commodity. It has a price. That price, like commodity prices,

is determined by competition and supply and demand. Labor, also pays Rent for his upkeep. Does the Rent the laborer pays increase the price that labor will receive for what he has to sell? Or—is not labor compelled to accept what competitors are willing to take regardless of what Rent they pay? It might be well for the author to explore this phase. An attack on the functions of Rent is far-reaching.

It would have seemed that an attack of so fundamental a nature as the author has made, a complete scientific analysis of Rent would have been the starting point. But both Rent and Price are scattered in a hit or miss fashion that has made this review one of the most difficult to approach constructively that this writer has ever contemplated.

The author announces the production of two more books. "The Murder of Economic Science" and the "Mistakes of Henry George." These books will no doubt be well written and breathe a noble spirit of idealism. It is hoped that he will establish his premises on much less controvertible ground and use a more scientific method and terminology, otherwise they, too, will cause "vigorous dispute." The titles of both books are, incidentally, ominous.

All that has been said has not in the least altered the high respect this reviewer has had for Mr. Jorgensen's enthusiasm and splendid efforts to spread the light as he sees it. It is hoped that the undoubted propaganda value of the later chapters will not be offset by the challenge to economic science in the first three.

Whether that will be so or not, the book is exceedingly well worth reading and study. One part will give the reader a splendid chance to find out whether he knows what he knows or not, and that part where he comes into agreement with George, will be found an admirable method and style to be used in placing the Remedy and its effects instructively and entirely before any reader.

NORMAN C. B. FOWLES.

## PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY

By JOHN Z. WHITE

Beaver Press, Grenville, Pa., 1935

In this timely and interesting book, Mr. White presents a legal viewpoint of the effect of grants of land by the State to individual owners. It is a common belief that because of deeds of land in "fee simple" to individuals which extend back to the sovereignty it is impossible for the State now to recover the value of the land without doing violence to constitutional provisions protecting private rights.

The author makes clear the distinction between a contract and a grant by the State. The Dartmouth College case, the Charles River Bridge case and other cases famous in history, are discussed in detail to show the tendency of the courts to preserve to the State those sovereign rights and powers without which democratic government is impossible.

Tenure of land is a public thing—a delegation of a sovereign power. Failure to guard the sovereign power expressed by land holding and to permit the value of the land holding power to be privately appropriated is a derogation of sovereignty and tends to destroy democracy.

If an aristocratic society is desired nothing needs to be done. The manor house theory of tenure of land is exemplified today in Franklin D. Roosevelt who is to the "manor born." It is quite in keeping with President Roosevelt's tradition to see nothing incongruous in the large land values held by Vincent Astor. There is nothing of the hypocrite in the President in this respect nor inconsistent with his warfare against those who grind the face of the poor or take speculative profits without regard to the upkeep of the nation at large. The ownership of the manor house and manor lands, to Mr. Roosevelt, carries with it not only the duty of seeing to it that all the manor people, tenants and workers, are fed and clothed but also the consciousness that failure to meet this duty is destructive of the manor family itself. So the Mitchells and the Wiggins who take profits without responsibility are met with righteous Rooseveltian indigna-

tion, whereas the landed families who give benevolent consideration to the tenantry receive a complacent blessing.

Against such a benevolent aristocracy Mr. White shows the necessity of preserving to the State its full sovereignty over land if democracy is to endure.

Land cannot be owned. It can only be used.

A labor product can be owned outright in the sense that it can be consumed. Eggs can be physically eaten up.

A land title is a franchise for use. Land cannot be consumed.

In this distinction lies the fundamental difference between a grant of land and a bill of sale of goods.

The proposition that land grants and franchises are the same in legal principle is sound law.

This being so, it follows that nothing more is granted than is directly contained in the terms of the grant. A franchise grant is strictly construed in favor of the sovereignty.

A grant of land made in 1735, for example, contains no contract that conveys away values created in 1935. What is granted is contained within the four corners of the document. Nothing is contained in any deed ancient or modern that requires the community in 1935 to deliver the beneficial use of a school house, a library, a paved street or other public service upon the land without collecting the cost therefor.

Chief Justice Marshall in 1810 in a Georgia land case held that a grant by the State is a contract. In 1840, however, Justice Miller, supported by Chief Justice Chase and Justice Field, dissented in *Washington University vs. Rouse* (8 Wall. 443). He said:

"We do not believe that any legislative body, sitting under a State constitution of the usual character, has a right to sell, to give, or to bargain away forever the taxing power of the State . . . To hold . . . that any one of the annual legislatures can, by contract, deprive the State forever of the power of taxation, is to hold that they can destroy the government which they are appointed to serve, and that their action in that regard is strictly lawful."

The tendency of the courts is in the direction of the sound doctrine quoted. The power of the State to tax is paramount over private rights.

Private possession of land, necessary to preserve the fruits of labor, does not of itself impair sovereignty. It is only when we permit the profits arising from this exercise of sovereign power to flow into private pockets that such impairment occurs.

Democracy may delegate its police power to a magistrate without impairing its sovereignty but if it were held that the magistrate acquired a vested right to his office and could administer the office for his private gain it would be a derogation of sovereignty.

Franchises for the use of streets by utility companies are no longer granted in perpetuity or for years without a valuation to be paid for use.

The true legal concept of the tenure of land as a franchise for use subject to valuation is growing in consciousness and is tending to dispel the idea that the State having granted land is without power to collect the value of the use.

This book is a strong plea for the recognition of those legal principles which constitute the foundation of democratic government and without democracy, cannot endure.

It is well worth a studious reading.—WALTER FAIRCHILD.

#### A BACHELOR OF LAWS "CORRECTS" A MASTER OF ECONOMICS

The publication of "Progress and Poverty" in 1879 let loose a flood of criticisms of Henry George. By hundreds, magazine articles, books, tracts, pamphlets, newspaper reviews poured forth, demonstrating George's "errors," and pointing out "fallacies" in his reasoning. More than one hundred have come into the possession of this reviewer, and he has not yet gathered all.

Many critics were not content to expose "flaws," but aimed their poisoned darts at the figure of Henry George. These shall remain nameless.

Today they are forgotten. Only a historian delving into obscure corners, could unearth their names and writings. "Progress and Poverty" lives on, sound as ever. It has made a profound impression on modern economic thought, and no economic treatise is so widely read. It is studied in our colleges and universities. Harvard, Princeton, University of Illinois, amongst others, (as the reports of The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation show) buy "Progress and Poverty" in increasing quantities.

A new school of critics has arisen. These, starting out with the admission that whatever economic knowledge they possess was acquired from Henry George, proceed, gently but firmly, to "correct" his reasoning. He being no longer available for personal attack, they now center their fire on his philosophy.

Of this ilk are George Bernard Shaw, whose book, "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism" we reviewed in these columns in the July-August, 1928 issue. (p. 121).

On another page, our co-worker, Mr. Fowles, competently handles another author who believes George "erred."

Our Australian friends, confusing interest with usury, are certain that George fumbled on that subject.

Most critics of George, while puffing with a sense of their own importance, wind up by exposing their own ignorance of fundamental economic principles.

Now comes "A Tax Talk to Business Men by William J. Ogden, LL. B." (Why is it necessary for our author to reveal that he is a Bachelor of Laws? What especial qualifications in economics does that degree confer?)

Mr. Ogden writes, (pp. 154-155):

"If ever 'truth' was 'crushed to earth,' the great cardinal truth of the Single Tax has so suffered at the hands of its professed authoritative protagonists.

"It is to rescue the truth from a jumble of truth and error, that this little book is written.

"Right here I want to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to Henry George. He, more than any other man, opened the way for the Single Tax on land values. The truth that his heart revealed is not destroyed by his manifest error. He will be remembered for his greatness of soul, his self-giving love for humanity, and his powerful presentation of the vital importance of a just system of taxation."

And at page 167, Mr. Ogden humbly writes:

"I have found the solution of his error, and with head bowed in deepest reverence, confess myself his grateful debtor for the revealed truth of the Single Tax, which is herein freed from any taint of Socialism or Communism."

Henry George, writes Mr. Ogden, "simply blundered in a splendid human effort to lead men to the truth." (p. 148).

He erred "in attributing the origin of land value to such a general and indefinite thing as 'population.'" (p. 149).

Will Mr. Ogden tell us when and where George wrote this? It was our impression that Henry George clearly showed that it was the presence *and activities* of people which produced land values. If population alone made land values, China, with 400 million people, would have higher land values than the United States with 125 million people.

Mr. Ogden contends "that public services are the reason, the source, and the continuance of land values," (p. 70) and that "land values are the products of the services of government." (p. 35).

His reasoning may be judged from this non sequitur:

"Here (in Maryland) our landowners pay taxes on their lands. They therefore earn the increment to their land values." (p. 63).

He repeatedly falls into the common error of referring to the Georgist philosophy as a "tax system." (pp. 83, 86, 107, 112, 154). Rather, it is a philosophy that would abolish taxation. For the community to collect its community-created land values and use them for community needs can never be called taxation. It is but to recognize the difference between "mine and thine" on the one hand, and "ours" on the other.



In writing as I have, I would not be understood as claiming errancy for Henry George. He would have been the last one to make such claim. But, I submit, it will take a more astute intelligence than Messrs. Bernard Shaw, Jorgenson, our Australian friends and Mr. Ogden, collectively, possess, to find any "lapsi linguae" in the numerous writings and speeches of the great master of economic reasoning.

Forty years ago, Mr. Ogden made the same claims in the columns of *The New Earth*. The editor of LAND AND FREEDOM pointed out to him that land values might exist, and often did exist, independently of public service. Mr. Ogden persists in his fallacy.

And here it will be interesting to quote from that article by Mr. Ogden:

"When I conceive of trade without roads, I may then conceive of land value arising without government service. When distance has been obliterated; and goods can be transferred without a consideration of the elements of time, space or resistance, then rent will disappear, and the dreams of some of our friends realized; but I am inclined to think that as long as we have legs, we'll use 'em, and that roads will always remain, and with them rent."

Well, the very thing Mr. Ogden conceived as impossible, has come to pass. Airplanes can and do carry mail and merchandise, "without roads;" "distance has been obliterated" (almost) *but land rent keeps increasing*.

Why? Because every human activity, even flying in the air, requires land, and those who "own" our earth can charge the users Rent, *without rendering any service in return*.

Mr. Ogden claims that George failed to perceive that individual right to land value is as clearly defined as individual right to any property produced by an individual.

Evidently our author is unaware that there are six qualities which distinguish land from private property, and therefore stamp it as unique.

1. The earth on which we live was not produced by any human being, but is the free gift of the Creator to all his children.
2. It is limited in quantity.
3. It is essential to our existence, because we can produce nothing without it.
4. It does not owe its value to anything which landowners choose to put upon it.
5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.
6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

Were he clearly to grasp the significance of these distinctions, he would not write:

"A good title to individual ownership in the land and all the value that attaches to it is therefore founded upon the same right of self-ownership that is the foundation of the right to own personal property." (p. 90).

Mr. Ogden informs us that before his death, Henry George modified his declaration that "private property in land is unjust." (p.112).

Pray, when and where did this take place? This reviewer is authorized to offer Mr. Ogden \$500.00 to substantiate that statement.

Chapter XVIII is entitled "The Error of Henry George." Our author attempts to prove that George made "a fundamental error in omitting the largest and most important factor in production, viz., Government." (pp. 144-145). Mr. Ogden contends that land value is produced by an individual "as truly as was the house and personal property therein." (p. 150).

If this were true, how will Mr. Ogden explain why land values decline when population moves away?

This chapter might more accurately have been entitled "The Errors of William J. Ogden, LL. B."

Mr. Ogden has been familiar with the Georgist philosophy at least forty years, but, as his book amply demonstrates, he has failed to grasp it, not only in its material phases, but in its vastly greater spiritual implications.

Henry George sought to introduce a spiritual condition of equality in a material condition of inequality. Only that which is spiritual is constant; that which is material must ever be inconstant. Our common Mother, the Earth, being material and inconstant, rather than spiritual and constant, does not yield to her children the same wages for the same labor.

Henry George showed how we could *approximate* a spiritual condition of equality in a material condition of inequality by expressing the inequalities in nature in land rent, and distributing the land rent equally amongst all Earth's children.

For that he will ever be remembered, long after his critics are forgotten.—B. W. BURGER.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"Labor Relations" by George A. Briggs of Los Angeles, member of the Federal Relations Board of the 15th District, sends forth a pamphlet of nineteen pages which treats of the Georgist philosophy. Incidentally it touches upon the abuse of patents. The author states that if the land value tax is insufficient it might be added to by "steeply" graded taxes on incomes and inheritances. The word seems deliberately chosen. He says: "Such taxes would compensate for failure, if we did fail, to identify and abolish lesser legalized monopolies overshadowed by patents, tariffs, franchises and landmonopolies." We do not believe that there are any "lesser monopolies" not included in this category, and they are not of sufficient importance to justify "steeply" graded taxes on incomes and inheritances, nor any such taxes at all. If it be found necessary to resort to such taxes, which we do not for a moment believe, they must be defended solely on the need for additional revenue that *might* arise and not as remedial measures for the correction of economic inequalities. All the lesser monopolies will disappear with the disappearance of the basic monopoly on which they rest.

\* \* \*

We all know and love Peter Witt, of Cleveland. Certainly the greatest orator in the movement today, he is also an entertaining and forcible writer. Here from his pen is a neatly printed pamphlet of sixteen pages entitled "How Economic Ignorance Causes Depressions." He tells of the work of Tom L. Johnson to whose memory he is deeply attached. He relates how a few years ago the city of Cleveland was worth fifty cents an acre and how since the days of Moses Cleaveland it has risen to be worth many millions of dollars. He enforces his plea for economic change in the system by many interesting local illustrations. The pamphlet may be had for ten cents a copy with reduction for quantities.—J. D. M.

## Correspondence

### NEED OF FUNDAMENTALS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A multitude of words anent our untoward and unnecessary economic material condition, but nothing along the line of remedies in simplified fundamental form.

Many reputations made in giving a speech or writing an article on existing conditions, in which nothing of importance is mentioned. There must be a reason for this, which must inevitably be termed indifference or ignorance.

It seems incredible that the so-called moulders of public opinion are unaware of the source and magnitude of our material supply—THE EARTH—sufficient for all our daily needs, provided same is treated in a natural way, in accord with the laws of justice.

The general notion seems to prevail that injustice is largely prevalent, but as an actual fact there is no such law. Apply the law of Justice and the thought of injustice vanishes into its native nothingness.

The entire situation revolves around a seeming lack of necessities,

such as Food, Raiment and Shelter. It would seem unnecessary to repeat to an intelligent people that these necessities are secured in only one way, viz., by application of our intelligence, muscular power and a sense of cooperation, to our supply, THE EARTH, which was supposedly created for all mankind. Man was given dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:26). We ask, what man, the one who first saw and claimed it, or all mankind?

It would be equally consistent and ethical to allow a monopoly of the sunshine and fresh air as the earth, a heritage from the Creator, which should not be held out of use for speculative purposes. We are either mentally blind or morally crooked. Cannot we realize that all wars are largely, almost entirely, caused by our economic maladjustment? They originate in greed, largely because of desire for additional territory to exploit. Men are also perfectly oblivious to crime conditions, especially among the younger generation.

This was especially emphasized in an article which appeared in the *Monitor* of February 21, by Ralph A. Felton, entitled, "Jobs or Jails for Youth," in which he states that eighty per cent of juvenile delinquents in a New Jersey reformatory were out of work when they got into trouble. They were inherently honest, but needed food in order to exist.

Is there a simple remedy for this unjust condition? There is only one scientific and ethical method, viz., cease penalizing (taxing) labor products, and take land values for public purposes.

Labor products belong to the producer; land values are produced by the community and should be appropriated for community uses. Of course, this solution is too simple for our expert economists to contemplate. It implies no statistical elaboration, historical data or prognostication anent the future; merely functions in the here and now. Why not give it a little brotherly thought for a change?

We cannot continue to ignore these fundamentals and maintain the title of Brotherhood.

Chicago, Ill.

F. J. EDDY.

#### COGENT AT LEAST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your May-June issue there appears a reply to Mr. Walter Fairchild by Harold S. Buttenheim in which Mr. Buttenheim closes with:

"Nor need the Single Taxers fear that the fundamental thesis of their great leader will be weakened by constructive attempts to re-study and re-state it for the world of 1935."

By all means, Mr. Buttenheim, re-study and re-state "Progress and Poverty," but when you do, also re-study and re-state the Commandment:

"Thou shalt not steal!"

For after you have brushed aside all of the trappings, the philosophy of Henry George reduces itself to this:

Let not the community take from the individual that which the individual creates. Let not the individual take from the community that which the community creates.

Unfortunately Single Taxers generally, go off on the same tangent that Mr. Buttenheim has. They accept the Single Tax as the end instead of the means to an end, the end being individual freedom.

Cleveland, O.

NAHAM BEN ISRAEL.

#### JOHN LUXTON RETURNS TO THE ENCOUNTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In the May-June number of LAND AND FREEDOM Mr. Loomis of Chicago attempts to justify his fallacious claim that there will be a selling value to land under the Single Tax. He says that in my reply I assume that Single Tax is to take one hundred per cent of the economic rent. Most certainly I do. And furthermore I declare it to be the only way in which full justice can be done and an equitable distribution of wealth be made. Mr. Loomis probably expects that

the full economic rent will be paid in money but in that he is wrong. We quite agree with Henry George in his suggestion that we permit the landowner to retain a percentage of the rent and thus escape the losses incident to renting lands in the way he mentions in "Progress and Poverty," Book VIII, Chapter II. In so doing we are collecting the entire rent, one hundred per cent of it. The landlord's services are equal to X per cent, and the rent which he pays over is equal to one hundred per cent plus X per cent. If we did not pay the landowner for collecting the ground rent, either from himself or from his tenants, we would have to pay an agent to do so. Thus we collect one hundred per cent of the economic rent, services plus money, or perhaps goods and services of equal value to money if the necessity for receiving the rent in that manner should eventuate. It seems to me that to be a good Single Taxer a man must first be a good economist, and that is where Mr. Loomis' trouble seems to be.

Mr. Buttenheim is quite enamoured of the idea of triple tax. It is enough for Single Taxers to know that he does not believe that all privilege and exploitation would be abolished by the socialization of ground rent, and that all community expenditures are reflected in increased land values. We do. A full and complete demonstration of the former must wait until we have advanced far enough to try it. Philosophy points that way to those who have logical minds. A detailed account of facts is necessary to prove the basis for his disbelief of the latter. Such facts must be actual and bona fide, not figures from reports of State tax officials, State Real Estate Boards, Chambers of Commerce, and other interested bodies. Until such facts are presented to us Mr. Buttenheim must not be offended if we do not believe him. We must have a chance to winnow the chaff from the grain, to point out what are real, legitimate community expenditures, and not just graft, waste, and downright loot. Away with most government reports. As contributions to our knowledge they are not worth the paper they are printed on, nor the energy necessary to read them. So Mr. Buttenheim's answer to Mr. Fairchild falls flat.

But it is not this which impells me to find fault with Mr. Buttenheim's logic. He attacks our consistency in fervently embracing the "benefits-received" theory of taxation, and rejecting the "ability-to-pay" theory. We do not ignore the fact that ability to pay has often resulted from benefits received. And in taxing according to benefits received do we go out of our way to exempt those who are able to pay because of benefits they have received? Under Single Tax the thing that will decide will be the benefits received. Mr. Buttenheim might have made a better case for himself and asked the question which every advocate of the "ability-to-pay" theory asks those who advocate the other method. The question is, "How are you going to tax those who haven't the ability to pay for benefits received?" That would give us the chance to answer in a way that shows that Single Tax is not going to be partial tax reform, weak and without teeth. The answer is that in case an individual or corporation has enjoyed a site value and either has not produced any economic rent through non-use of the site to its fullest possibility, or has made way with, squandered, dissipated the economic rent, the State or community will pry such individual or corporation from such site and lease it to the highest bidders. It is the moral duty of society to relieve members of society of burdens beyond their strength. To relieve the holder of a valuable site from the burden of carrying it when he shows his positive unfitness for the job is justice, justice to a poor weak brother, and justice to those of us who are ready to show their ability to make the most of such an opportunity.

In most instances, since man is naturally industrious and ambitious always seeking improvement, and creating new wants as he satisfies old ones, it follows that if we tax according to benefits received, we are also taxing according to ability to pay. But the method of taxing according to ability to pay is not always taxing according to benefits

received. Taxes on wages and interest are not taxes on benefits received, for true wages and true interest are received in return for services of equal value. To tax them is to create a one-sided condition in which something is given in return for nothing. Taxes on land values are taxes on benefits received, and such taxes create a balance, value for value, if the taxes equal one hundred per cent of the economic rent. It is idle to argue that wages and interest are received only because we receive the benefits of government, security and justice. We may receive our full wages under conditions of no government, and the best governments can not secure our wages to us.

There is *no ethical nor economic justification* for a system of taxation based even *in part* on the principle that the strong, the clever, or the lucky, should bear the burden of the weak, or the stupid, or the luckless, Mr. Buttenheim to the contrary, notwithstanding. Such talk is sentimental bosh, and worst of all, it bolsters up a situation that will wreck the public if not stamped out. It is ethical and it is economic justice that we have a system of taxation that will not permit the strong and the clever to be robbed for the misfits of society, that will not allow the existence of a "lucky class" nor of a privileged class, a system that will guarantee to each the fruits of his labor, that will permit no man to eat except in the sweat of his brow, nor any man to reap where he has not sown. Such a system, by assuring every man economic justice, will gradually produce men who are strong, clever and just. We believe that Single Tax will do this, that no coddling, nor paternalism, nor charity, nor despotism can do it, in short we believe in a true democracy. It is too bad that Mr. Buttenheim claims familiarity with "Progress and Poverty." It is too evident that his knowledge of the truths therein exposed is purely superficial.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

#### HOW ABOUT PAYMENT FOR SERVICE OF COLLECTION?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The confusion of thought shown by some of your correspondents regarding the selling value of land under the Georgist system will disappear if it is kept in mind that rent is for public service and for access to advantages maintained by the public either with public or private funds.

The service bill is like the gas bill or the electric light company's bill.

It would be as much in order to allow a consumer of gas a discount as compensation for paying his bill as it would be to leave the land owner a percentage for turning in the rent. A discount for prompt payment might be considered; but a discount for payment, never.

In case of a hotel or office building, the owner needs a location for his building just as he needs a roof on his building. He would pay his rent, all of it; just as he would pay for the roof, all of it. In both cases because he wished to be considered honest.

If the rent is proper and reasonable, it is what the public must have to maintain the advantages for which the rent is paid. If it is not all turned in, the public incurs a loss servicing the location. Any loss would have to be made up by either stock assessments (taxes) levied on the citizens or else by curtailment of the service. In the latter case it would be made up by sacrifice and hardship.

When people "invest in land," they are really not investing in the land at all; but investing in an opportunity to buy our public service at less than the market rate and to sell it back to us at the market (the rental) rate.

So long as and whenever land has a selling price we may be certain that the Georgist system is not in force. When it is in force, land will have no more selling value than has the privilege of buying gas from the gas company. As a matter of fact land is, as one of your correspondents so nicely says, just a place to work—just a privilege. As the privilege of buying gas has no selling value in the market now, so land will have none under our system—and for the same reason, that there will be nothing to be made buying for re-sale. All unused

land will be unclaimed land and the competition of this "commons" will prevent other land from having a price other than its rent.

Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

#### RENT, TAXES AND PRICES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

You have ably condemned (March-April issue) the futile "New Deal" efforts to regulate wages, instead of opening up natural opportunities for the free production on which alone they depend. The effort to help wages by ploughing under and killing-off production so as to raise prices, is so obviously unnatural, however, as to arouse resentment notwithstanding "our decline" in independent thinking, and it is important to clearly point out that even the direct purpose of this New Deal effort (raising prices) is absolutely wrong; that the free production which alone insures normal wages also insures their natural purchasing power.

Whatever reduces the cost and prices of products, increases the purchasing power of wages, which of course is the only measure of their highness or lowness. And as reduction of taxes on production, and use of improved tools and methods of producing, reduce both costs and prices, they are the natural ways of increasing purchasing power and are therefore wholly desirable.

Failure to recognize this obvious truth arises from established interferences with the free employment of labor in producing so as to earn wages, for which there is only the one remedy of freeing access to land. It cannot be reasonably questioned that whatever reduces the cost and prices of products is inherently beneficial.

This truth makes it practically important to show how the taking of rent for public uses will really affect the cost and prices of labor products and the consequent purchasing power of normal wages; for the accepted fact that rent cannot directly enter into price would seem to exclude any effect of Single Tax on prices.

It is only necessary, however, to bear in mind the equally accepted truth that taxes on production do enter into cost and price; and that such taxes must be substituted for any rent that is privately diverted;—in order to see that this privately-diverted rent does actually enter indirectly into costs and prices as taxes on production; and that Single Tax would cut out all such substituted taxes from costs of production, with corresponding reduction of prices.

It is of course true that all the advantages of favored sites over marginal (no-rent) land, must in any case be paid by the favored users; but payment to government will put an end to present enormous taxes on production, and also to present high production costs due to the speculative withholding of land from use which pushes rent-free production onto poorer land.

But the great reduction of cost and prices directly resulting from public collection of rent, is not all that must result from it. For it is unquestionably true that public collection of rent will eliminate interest costs due to the present false capitalizing of that portion of rent which is now privately-diverted; and it is also certain that general prosperity due to free employment and production will make capital plentiful so long at least as prosperous human beings prefer to insure themselves against forced or voluntary retirement, instead of relying on humiliating pensions; so that further reduced costs and prices must naturally result with corresponding increased purchasing power of natural wages.

But here is the fundamental error which causes futile and foolish efforts to unnaturally control costs and prices: Namely, failure to recognize that *there is a natural wage*; that the normal products of labor properly measure wages; that under equalized opportunities of production, with proper use of known tools and methods of production, and with freedom from tribute to idle ownership, "natural wages" are automatically determined by natural production. And these natural wages with their natural purchasing power, call for natural instead of arbitrarily regulated conditions.

Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART.

## MORE ABOUT INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. T. J. Kelly, in his very entertaining letter on this subject, sets out quite a number of fundamental economic truths which I think all Single Taxers will fully endorse. Georgists who oppose interest, however, will not be satisfied. It is not what Mr. Kelly puts into his letter that is vital, but what he leaves out. Friday, making a fishing net for Crusoe, is entitled to receive fish while the net lasts, (the equivalent of hire), but when it is worn out he should get nothing at all. If he would eat fish indefinitely he must make nets indefinitely. He cannot, under the circumstances in which he is placed and where no "money" exists, eat without working unless he owns land. *The onus is on him to replace his capital.* Had Friday, however, been able to lend Crusoe the price of a net, say twenty dollars, the contract, under conditions such as exist in civilized countries, would have been that Crusoe should supply him with fish until such time as the twenty dollars were repaid, and Crusoe himself, *not Friday*, would have had to make all his nets after the first. And, although the repayment of the loan would end Crusoe's obligation to feed Friday, it would affect not the latter's power to obtain fish without working, since he would re-lend the twenty dollars and repeat the performance with other borrowers, ad infinitum. He could also pass this power on to his heirs and assigns for ever.

Mr. Kelly's insistence on the perishability of *tangible* capital is a very strong argument in favor of those who repudiate interest as levied under existing conditions. I would like to see him attempt to persuade your readers that the twenty dollars must perish *by the mere effluxion of time* in the same way. In order to forestall time-wasting replies I would emphasize that the periodical re-payment of loans, as shown above, does not affect my argument. Neither does the fact that fishing nets add enormously to the production of fish. No one denies the existence of "economic interest."

In conclusion, I would like to say that a study of the position in New Zealand goes to show that the economic rent of the dominion is approximately one-third of the national production. No calculation based on Ricardo's law, can make it any more at present. Interest takes about the same proportion. It is futile then to assert, as some supporters of interest do, that interest is merely economic rent in disguise. A small amount of it may be, but not the bulk. I think the position is much the same in other countries, and that is the reason I hold that the "Socialization of Rent" will treble wages, for I believe, both rent and interest *paid to idlers*, will be eliminated under the Georgian plan.

C. H. NIGHTINGALE.

## RURAL "LAND VALUES"

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your May-June issue Harold S. Buttenheim seems, at first glance, to dispose of the claim of Walter Fairchild in the preceding issue, that rural areas tend to have less of their total real estate valuation in land values than do urban areas. Citing the sixteen States which furnish assessment figures bearing on this question, Mr. Buttenheim purports to show that, "without exception, improvements constituted a larger proportion of total real estate values in urban than in rural areas."

This does not, however, demolish Mr. Fairchild's case. Mr. Buttenheim errs in identifying the "land value" in these impressive looking statistics with the true economic land value which Georgists would tax. The urban land values cited in the statistics probably are not far from being identical with what we mean by land values. Agricultural land value, on the other hand, as interpreted by assessment officials, commonly includes very much more than the component which we call land value or site value. Of a farmer's real estate, they account only his house, barns and other structures as improvements, and consider the market price of his land to be his "land value." In so doing, they ignore the fact that often by far

the greater part (sometimes practically all) the selling price of the farm land is due to improvements *in* (as distinct from *on*) the land, such as its cleared, smoothed and fenced condition, its artificial soil enrichment, invisible drainage system, etc. These are as truly improvements as barns and silos, though not so accounted in the figures used by your correspondent, and are now taxed as "land value." Under our plan they would be exempt. Probably a great obstacle to Single Tax progress amongst farmers is this misapprehension as to what we mean by land values; a misapprehension from which your correspondent does not appear to be free.

Norfolk, Conn.

JOSEPH R. CARROLL.

## THE TAX RACKET

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The old tax "racket," suggested to Louis XIII, by his prime minister, Richelieu, "taxes should be levied in proportion to the ability to pay," is being worked a-plenty by politicians and news reporters, also cartoonists. Even some statesmen and a few editors, who are a bit hazy on political and social economics and the evil effects of taxation, are trying to justify the imposition of an income tax on corporations and individuals who are the most capable, while utterly disregarding the fact that such taxes are wrapped up with and included in the price of goods and services that everybody needs to buy, and, "the consumer pays the tax."

They also ignore the fact that, in trade, business, industry and commerce, potential buyers and sellers are often "kept apart by price." They appear to forget that the unemployed are in their unhappy state because those who are working cannot buy all they want on account of high prices and low wages. They overlook the fact that in taxing the rich, the poor and all others are taxed by proxy. About the same money is spent but less labor is paid for.

It may be soothing to the emotions to "soak the rich" with taxes but it doesn't get us anywhere. We only succeed in making our own life harder and our country a less comfortable place in which to live. Those who are known as "Captains of Industry" and are the managers of "Big Business" cannot employ more labor or pay higher wages when their product is unsaleable due to high prices that must be demanded to pay overhead that is swollen by tax levies, and cost of collecting and paying those taxes. They are helpless in the matter of creating demand by cutting the price of their product while government throttles them with taxes, hampers them with regulations and requires them to perform governmental functions such as: Collecting taxes from consumers with which to pay their own assessments.

There are few, I believe, who question the high motive behind President Roosevelt's attack on "bigness," and, his objective may (?) be desirable, but there are those who predict, and I think they are right, that the methods suggested, some of which seem likely to be adopted, will prove to be very disappointing as reform measures and will retard, rather than promote, recovery. It is certain that taxing the rich who get their income by selling services or goods to the rest of us, holds out no hope to consumers that the price of anything which everybody wants to buy will come down. On the other hand, there is reason to anticipate much higher prices for consumer's goods and services and, due to diminished demand, a great reduction in the prices for capital goods such as wheat, cotton and other basic commodities, and labor.

Instead of more taxes being levied to further burden everybody the taxes now in force should be shifted from where they now are to where they would be a commanding factor in reducing the price of everything that everybody wants to buy and at the same time raise wages and prices for farm products. A tax on land values only would do just that, and no other tax would be needed.

Aberdeen, S.D.

CHARLES J. LAVERY, M.D.

"The progress of rivers to the ocean is not so rapid as that of man to error."—VOLTAIRE.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

ALEXANDER HAMILTON of Victoria, B. C., writes: "Have just received your magazine for May-June and was thrilled with Comment and Reflection. It reads like inspiration; would that all could see and understand it."

HON. P. FRANK MORROW, of the Washington State Senate, writes: "The people of this State have been made tax conscious through the enactment of a vicious sales tax by the last legislature." Mr. Morrow bewails the lack of efficient organization among Single Taxers of the State.

"I LIKE your Comment and Reflection, especially what you say of the NRA farce," writes Philip Kleinschmidt of Leadville, Col.

THE Bridgeport, Conn. *Post* of June 13, prints letters from John C. Rose, Joseph R. Carroll and H. W. Noren in reply to G. R. Ouch who couches a lance in opposition to the Single Tax.

WE are sorry to announce the death on June 21 of William A. Black of San Antonio, Texas, for many years the foremost Single Tax leader in that State, and former member of the State Legislature. His letters and articles were frequent in the newspapers throughout Texas. His widow has expressed a desire to continue his work if she can get the cooperation of Single Taxers in the State. Mr. Black was seventy-seven years old and leaves besides his widow a seventeen year old son. He came to San Antonio in 1905 from Kansas City where he practised law.

FREDERICK VERINDER of London has just completed a new book on the progress of the Single Tax, to be accompanied by a special appendix giving a record of legislative advances in our direction in New Zealand, Australia; South Africa, Canada, Denmark, Northern Nigeria, Malay and other countries.

DR. JAMES H. DILLARD of the University of Virginia, writes: "I have known three really great men, men who were great in themselves, not men who were counted great because of some high position they held. They were John Fiske, Henry George and Booker Washington."

GEORGE HUGHES of Topeka, Kan., writes: "Foley's Questions and Answers I found to be of remarkable value."

In a letter recently received from Will Atkinson, which want of space will not permit us to print, he tells us that he is writing a series of papers stressing the need of recognition of natural laws. He says: "We cannot abolish competition but we can and must abolish the man-made restrictions on competition caused by privilege."

ED. DOTY of Cleveland is sometimes caustic but always interesting. He writes: "I see that Grace Isabel Colbron idly scribbling on her menu card at the recent dinner in New York wrote, Separate assessment (of land and improvements) is the beginning of tax wisdom. That just isn't so. We have had separate assessments in Ohio since 1851 and tax wisdom has never had a toe-hold in Ohio. I do not cry separate assessment. Without it there can be no tax wisdom and with it there is none."

DR. C. J. LAVERY of Aberdeen, S.D., speaking of the Henry George Congress to be held in New York in September: "We who know our fundamentals should take advanced ground in presenting method, method and yet more method. The people of Missouri are not the only ones who have to be shown. One concrete example like shift-

ing all taxes from transportation facilities to land values, in exchange for a substantial cut, about fifty per cent, in carrying charges would show everybody the practical value of the Henry George philosophy better than anything else."

HENRY WARE ALLEN, of Wichita, Kan., writes congratulating us on our birthday and gives us the following hopeful outlook:

I understand that Mr. George was well satisfied with the progress made at the time of his death and I can testify that when it comes to conversations with the average man his philosophy is almost invariably accepted with but little hesitation. This being true I believe now as Henry George did during his life time that the lump has been leavened and that when the philosophy is put to practice on a large scale it will spread like wildfire.

CITY SOLICITOR WARD BONSAALL of Pittsburgh, close friend and legal adviser to Mayor McNair, is dead of heart attack. A Single Taxer for many years and active in governmental work, his death is a severe loss to the McNair administration. Mayor McNair says of him, "He was an able lawyer and a man of very high character. He served the city well and I am at a loss to know where I can find any one to replace him." Mr. Bonsall was sixty-one. He leaves a wife, Mrs. Adrienne C. Bonsall, and a son and daughter. For Mr. Bonsall's post John M. Henry, well-known Single Taxer, is being considered.

THE California legislature during the recent session voted the highest volume of taxes ever levied upon Californians. This highest budget in the history of the State amounted to \$376,656,299.

THE announcement of the death of Father J. O. S. Huntington at the age of eighty recalls a devoted friend of the movement who in the old Academy of Music in 1886 and 1887, as well as at the Henry George Congress in this city, appeared in clerical garb to propound the economic gospel of the author of "Progress and Poverty."

OUR old yet ever active friend Frank G. Anderson, of Jamestown, N. Y. in *Skandia*, a local Swedish newspaper of that city, explains in a two-column article the doctrine we hold. The heading of Mr. Anderson's article translated into English is "The Taxation System Must Be Made Just."

DAN BEARD's eighty-fifth birthday was honored by letters of congratulations from Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Beard celebrated his birthday by throwing tomakawks at Indian war posts.

M. S. ENGLEMAN of Dallas, Texas, failing to receive the May-June issue of this paper, wrote in: "How's a fellow to get along without LAND AND FREEDOM?"

JOHN M. MILLER of South Egremont, Mass., wants the names and addresses of Single Taxers in his neighborhood. Will those who note this get into communication with him?

HON. P. FRANK MORROW of Seattle, Wash., continues active in the good work. He spoke at the Open Forum which meets at the Meeves Cafeteria to about one hundred persons, and at the Old Age Club at Moose Hall to nearly 600, and again at the King's County Democratic Club.

OLIVER SMITH in the issue of *Liberty* of June 15 says of Naslund's "The Voice of Verdun" that it is "a war story far above the average."

BILLY RADCLIFFE, N. T. (which initials stand for "no taxes") now in his eighty-fifty year, gets a lot of satisfaction in attending the Henry George School in Cleveland.



## CHAINED

**A** *New Illustrated Brochure* containing 30 halftone pictures and text matter, showing the increase of poverty with the increase of wealth.

Printed on a fine offset paper and sold to you at less than the printing cost. Buy as many as you can distribute to prospective students. Price 5c a copy.

PHONE OR MAIL YOUR ORDERS TO

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**

211 W. 79TH STREET, NEW YORK

Telephone: SUsquehanna 7-1167

IT'S EASY FOR YOU TO

# Start a Class

IN

## “Progress and Poverty” Later, Build a School

That's the sure-fire way to help. You learn your economics by studying this great book. Help others get the truth in the same way. Get some of your friends—three, six or a dozen—to agree to read regularly assigned portions of the book, and to meet once a week at your home or office to discuss what they have read. You can direct the discussion easily and properly with a

## Teacher's Manual

This valuable book was compiled by the late Oscar H. Geiger in his work of teaching “Progress and Poverty.” It is the result of years of painstaking study—also of practical application to class room work. With this Manual—containing 263 questions and answers, suggestions on how to conduct discussions, regular reading assignments, illustrative charts—you can easily conduct your class through the eight lessons to a complete understanding of the message of Henry George. You will enjoy it and you will be doing something real in advancing the cause. Your friends will appreciate the knowledge.

## The Price--\$1.00

Organize your group—send for your Manual and start spreading the light **Now!**

As long as they last these Manuals will be supplied by the

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**

Extension Course Department

211 West 79th Street

New York

September—October, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

Henry George Congress

September 26 - 27 - 28

What Are We Going To Do About It?

Frank Chodorov

The Story of Tax Relief for Land

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress  
Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 302 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

## SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 5 WHOLE No. 192

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,

Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....The Editor	139
WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?..Frank Chodorov	144
THE SINGLE TAX.....Henry George	148
A STORY OF TAX RELIEF FOR LAND .....Harry Gunnison Brown	150
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS. SEPT. 26, 27 and 28.....	156
ADDRESS ON WORK OF THE SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION.....Antoinette Kaufmann	161
LETTER OF LORD SNOWDEN.....	163
EXTENSION CLASSES OF HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL .....John Lawrence Monroe	164
CONGRESS NOTES.....	165
THE IMPORTANCE OF FREE TRADE. ADDRESS AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....Stephen Bell	166
CONTEMPLATING THE HERE AND NOW...F. J. Eddy	168
WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.....	169
BOOK REVIEW AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.....	171
CORRESPONDENCE.....	172
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	173

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1935

No. 5

## Comment and Reflection

**A**MONG the explanations of the cause of the depression one that recurs most frequently is the World War. It is heard in speeches in Congress, in editorials, and often in the more thoughtful dissertations of prominent writers. Thus Mr. J. G. Lockhart in a recent work entitled "The Peace Makers," says: "The world did not fully recover from the Napoleonic Wars until a full generation had passed and the middle of the nineteenth century had been reached," and then he follows with the lesson from analogy that "we may not expect full recovery until about the year 1954."

**J**UST how wars work to produce depressions we are not informed, nor is any effort made to clear up the matter, beyond the remark casually let drop by Mr. Lockhart that "war is an expensive process." An analogy that seems to have been completely forgotten is the prosperity that followed our own Civil War, which would seem to require some counter explanation. The theory falls to the ground the moment it is examined.

**F**OR one thing, such explanation is too easy. We are, as a matter of fact, living in a constant depression—low wages, industrial insecurity and mass poverty. These are accentuated by periods of more acute distress which go under the name of "depressions." The times that we are out of these depressions are infrequent enough and to call them periods of prosperity is an abuse of language. With the masses of men there are always depressions. There are no times of prosperity—there are only times of less acute distress, less wide-spread poverty.

**A**RE such theories conscious attempts to evade inevitable conclusions following a closer analysis? We think not. They are born of a superficial analysis of the social problem, and an ignorance of economic factors. That escape out of the depression must wait until 1954, that not until then may we overcome the disastrous effect of a war that ended in 1918, will seem fantastic on reflection. For however great was the destruction of wealth resulting from the World War, a period of ten years would have more than sufficed for the replacement of that loss.

**W**HAT these theories naively ignore, are of course the economic factors. The very instant the flags are furled and peace declared, these economic factors, rudely interrupted by the chaos of conflict, begin their work. Mr. Lockhart writes as follows: "History, if we omit the rare and incalculable interference of the abnormal, is the product not of a few spectacular actions, but of innumerable events, unnoticed but irresistible in cumulations."

**T**HE problem is incorrectly stated. History is not governed by the "interference of the abnormal," nor yet by "innumerable events," but by law, among which is the working of economic factors. These "innumerable events" are not the cause of social dislocations, but are the effect of the ignoring of natural laws. Wars themselves are the effects. What we amusingly call peace are only wars disguised. Nations that arm themselves with hostile tariffs are not only preparing for war—actually they are at war. And their conflicts of diplomacy are but one remove from armed conflict.

**A**FTER war, as after the World War, to which is erroneously attributed the depression, economic trends are once again in full swing. The same old round is to be traversed again. The same old stumbling blocks to progress remain. The same slow impoverishment of the workers that results from the taking of private wealth for public purposes and the gradual encroachment of speculative rent, paralyzing labor and capital, go on as before. These forces are at all times sufficient to account for the stagnation of industry without recourse to imaginary theories to account for periods of depression which differ from the normal only in intensity. The phenomena we observe, low wages, poverty, unemployment are the resultants of a denial of the natural order and not of the merely temporary dislocations caused by wars from which we soon recover, going from the horrors of war into the horrors of peace, which are only a little less devastating.

**I**T is safer as a mode of reasoning leading to sound conclusions, to consider economic theories in accordance with the economic facts, or in other words using the factors that belong to that special domain. If what

we know as economic laws work the same under the same conditions; if we deny men's right to the use of the earth; if, recognizing trade as a part of production, we nevertheless strangle trade by tariffs and taxes, we have a sufficient explanation of poverty and human misery without the resort to any other theory to account for what we see. Yet the proneness to consider theories of economic facts while ignoring economic factors is responsible for much unreason. We shall never get far until we look upon political economy as a science and consider it in the terms that belong to it.

**T**HESE terms and relations are simple enough. Nothing indeed can be simpler. If land is a place to get things out of that we know by the name of wealth, and the earth is the only reservoir of human needs, by what natural law do we pay others for the permission of access to it? What is property? What is wealth? What are wages? Correct answers to these questions comprise all that need be known as political economy. All that is needed now is not to write books about it unless it is for the purpose of clearing away cobwebs. Henry George has written it in a great book which only an insane man would hope to improve upon, and in writing this book he has probably condemned a million other books, written or to be written, to a merited oblivion.

**W**E can never cease to be amazed at the difficulty men and women find in the comprehension of natural laws. It would seem they are about the last things they recognize—certainly the last things they are able to reason about. Yet the failure to apprehend them lies at the basis of nearly all our troubles. That the relations of men are subject to mechanical devices is the fundamental error of the Socialists. It is also at the basis of the Roosevelt fallacies, now in partial eclipse. The laws of cooperation and competition work such wonders when left to themselves that it would seem they could not be wholly overlooked. The need of reconciling human relations to these laws would seem to be obvious enough. But so little are men willing to trust these laws that *laissez faire* has come to be regarded as a horned beast. The industrial body must be treated to potions and plasters and the natural powers of recovery are never called into play. Even medicine has made more advances than that.

**I**T is quite impossible to catalogue the various explanations and remedies offered for the depression. Some of the "remedies" are incredibly silly because the diagnosis is almost invariably at fault. We have examined the war theory, but what shall be said of another rather numerous group who look to wars as the source of prosperity, thus reversing the theory that wars are responsible

for depressions. The technocrats have had their day and have faded out of the picture. Overpopulation and overproduction have done some service. There still lingers the notion, no less vague and indistinct than a host of others, that the machine age is responsible for the times through which we are passing, and that really nothing can be done about it unless we accept government ownership of the means of production.

**J**UST when the "machine age" began there seems to be some uncertainty. But considered rationally it must have had a beginning. The substitution of a spade for a stick in digging potatoes seems like the commencement of the so-called "machine age," but we cannot be quite certain of that. The substitution of the sewing machine for the needle might set a definite beginning for the machine age, but again we cannot be too sure. For the needle is a kind of machine. Anything that fortifies the hand, or substitutes mechanical appliance for physical labor, or adds to it, is a machine, and the process of such substitution is as old as the cave man, or older. When men talk of a machine age they are talking of civilization and processes coeval with the appearance of man on the planet. If the relation of man to land is understood there is no problem here. Every invention, every advance in the processes of production under normal relations, with free access to land, increases the opportunities for the production of wealth.

**I**T is the closing of natural resources, the blackmail laid upon industry by those who contribute nothing to industry, the ever increasing tribute demanded of labor and capital, that bedevils the process and leads the intellect astray. Once the factors in this very simple problem are understood it becomes no longer complicated. It is no longer a money question. It is no longer something that calls for planning—the plan is already made. It is no longer a question of too many people in the world—nature saw to that when the world was created. It is no longer a question of overproduction—too many good things for too many people in the world, a mathematical contradiction which we hear from the same lips. All these strange absurdities prevail and would require the pen of a Dean Swift to fitly characterize.

**W**E hear it said that "our industrial system has broken down." In one sense it has—in another and more important sense it has not. It is not necessary to rebuild the industrial system. Let us leave that to our ingenious friends, the Socialists, and their brothers, the social planners at Washington. If they would but recognize that what appears to be the breakdown of the system is not due to any inherent defects in the system itself, but to a *dislocation of the factors*. These factors

have been ignored—their proper functioning in the industrial system misapplied. There is nothing the matter with the system itself if these functions are recognized for what they are, and the office they fill and the work they do, properly apportioned. The industrial system has apparently broken down because the factors have not been recognized for what they are by those whose duty it is to teach, the statesmen and politicians, and the heads of our institutions of learning from which only occasionally a lucid voice is forthcoming.

THE notion that we need a central regulating power over industry explains the opposition to the Constitution and its interpretation by the Supreme Court in the recent N.R.A. decision. Paul Blanchard in a recent number of *The Forum* complains that the Constitution hampers progress because "it prevents a central control of our economic life and a unified system of labor laws." For our part we would be quite as distrustful of unified control of our economic life by politicians temporarily in power as in the hands of the nine able gentlemen who constitute the Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the Constitution is more flexible than "unified control" in the hands of a strong administration. It has been amended twenty-one times in 150 years. It is far from being a static instrument since it provides for its own modification by direct amendment. And we were told years ago by Peter Finley Dunne, somewhat cynically, that decisions of the Supreme Court "follow the election returns." So we may rest in that assurance if all else fails us.

BUT the very centralized powers for which Mr. Blanchard contends are a danger more imminent and perilous than any possible usurpation of power by the Supreme Court. We would not lightly ignore certain considerations, but some thoughtful men are saying that a dictatorship has been averted by the Supreme Court decision. We will not go so far as to assert this, but certain recent developments in the process of vesting in the Executive unusual powers have held a menace which it were wise not to underestimate.

NO doubt the power of forty-eight states to legislate in their own way on all matters which are not interstate opposes an obstacle to "unified control of labor," and we for one are glad of it. We would rather bear the possible inconveniences, if there are any, in favor of the forty-eight experiment stations in the legislatures of forty-eight states. It seems to us that democracy has a better fighting chance. We are glad that the Supreme Court stands as a guardian over the rights of the states. We have forty-eight times more faith in the emulative example of half a hundred legislatures competing for adventure in social progress than

a centralized government at Washington, however sloppily benevolent.

WE have made some progress in economic thought. No complaint that unemployment arises from laziness or improvidence is likely to be heard again. Nor is it probable that any great paper like the *Chicago Tribune* will again advance the giving of arsenic to the unemployed, the tramp or the striker. Strikes have become almost popular and unemployment too familiar a phenomenon. No future president of a great railroad system will advocate that strikers crying for food should be given "rifle diet and see how they like that kind of food." No, newspapers and railroad officials have grown if not more humane at least more cautious. So much has been gained for the cause of sanity and a calmer outlook upon the social problem.

HOW little we can depend on the teachings of so-called radical journals like *The Nation* is shown by their attitude toward the Supreme Court decision. *The Nation* says: "The President cannot complain about his luck. The Supreme Court has given him a new chance to assert his leadership after he himself has forfeited many golden opportunities. We think that he now has the best issue of his career." If *The Nation* really understood the economic issues involved it would hail the Supreme Court decision on the N.R.A. as a great step in the preservation of our liberties. We have no grave objection to amending the Constitution in a way that will restrict its power over national legislation. But that merely looks to a possible improvement of the instrument itself, and the Constitution provides the method of procedure. It is unfortunate that the issue should be presented at this time when the decision is in accordance with the best traditions of a liberty-loving people.

IF there is need for an amendment to the Constitution it is a pity that the chief protagonists of such change should be those who have shown small comprehension of American traditions. We should far rather trust the future of this republic with the men composing the Supreme Court than with Franklin Delano Roosevelt and those comprising the milk and water socialistic school of *The Nation* and *The New Republic*. There is, we believe, little to choose between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Villard. Neither school to which these men belong has the faintest conception of natural law in wealth distribution, and both seem to think that laissez faire and the operation of free competition disastrous in their results. Neither school has the faintest conception of human liberty. *The Nation* has done some good service on occasions for the defense of human rights, but what man's fundamental rights are is left to conjecture.

LET *The Nation* speak for itself. In one article entitled "A Constitutional Plutocracy," it says: "Our mutual life is dominated by agriculture and commerce. Unless they can be controlled by the nation the government of the country virtually passes to them." We say now that this is un-American doctrine. It is bad economics; it is Socialism half disguised. They are words if they mean anything that lead straight to Karl Marx. No wonder the Supreme Court decision irritates men who believe as they do in federal control of all means of earning a livelihood. The control of economic factors by forty-eight states is not enough. Statute law and the civil law we are told are not sufficient to guard against abuses. So the federal power must be asked to step in and work its wonders.

*The Nation* writer continues: "How can the situation be met? Met it must be, for without action we are confirmed as the serfs of big business." This is the sheerest kind of nonsense. In this instance the Supreme Court stands for sound economics and American liberty. The bigness of big business is a negligible factor. *The abolition of monopoly is all that is demanded*, but *The Nation* is not willing to take this step. It prefers to fight the Supreme Court decision when such decision is a victory for the principles of American liberty which we have cherished for 150 years and to which *The Nation* now and then has contributed some lip service.

REMEMBER now that in all of this Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard proposes no reform in the process by which we are (to quote) "handed over to the mercies of a business and fundamental plutocracy." Did indeed the Supreme Court decision do this to us? If so it is really imperative that something be done about it. Why these strictures against the Constitution and the Supreme Court and not against the powers to which we are now "handed over, bound hand and foot?" Will this kind of dreary nonsense find disciples? Is the answer that if Henry Ford's plant is now too big it should be made smaller, and by federal enactment? That big farms be split up into smaller farms? If the objection is to big business may we not ask, "How big?" Nothing here about monopoly that operates against both big and little businesses. Nothing against federal meddling and taxes that choke little businesses as well as big. Nothing to show that the earth is closed against industry, that men are denied a place to work, that capital and labor, big and little businesses, are crushed by the exactions of land monopoly.

IT seems to be the opinion of *The Nation* that everybody not opposed to the Supreme Court decision is committed to the status quo. If to reject the status quo means the acceptance of "production for use rather than

profit," which is a fundamental tenet in *The Nation's* Socialism—we are indeed committed to the rejection of all such nonsense. For is not all production for use, and is not profit the incentive and the real wages of production?

IN making his fight against the Supreme Court, if President Roosevelt should deem this essential for his reelection, he will have with him the forces of organized labor. There is little hope here for any real effort to get at the root of the matter. We shall hear nothing of fundamental economics, of course. These will be carefully kept in the background. The leaders of the A. F. of L. are for the most part politicians who will strive only to retain their power. The fight is none of ours though we may well remind both principals to the controversy that wages and hours of labor are not something in the power of any tribunal to regulate. They will learn this some day when they cease their shadow boxing. They will no longer serve as pawns in the game, whether played by politicians of the stamp of Hoover or Roosevelt.

THE condition of the tenants of the State of Georgia, once called, because of its greater enterprise, "The Yankee land of the South," is described as deplorable. The State can no longer be singled out from portions of the less progressive South. At least this is true of a part of Georgia. The landlords have seen to it that the land which yields abundance, which despite the fact that if the farmer can get a piece of land to work he can live comfortably all his life, the opportunity is closed against him.

HERE is such an obvious lesson that it seems impossible it can be ignored much longer. The impudence of a certain section of Georgia landlords passes all comprehension. One is reported to have said: "If a tenant makes a living he ought to be satisfied instead of trying to make more. When they come and tell me they are not making enough I tell them to get off my land and stay off." No wonder Erskine Caldwell, who has contributed a series of papers to the *New York Evening Post*, says: "The landowner-tenant system will have to go. No act of its own is motivated by any desire save that of profit at the expense of the physical, moral and economic welfare of the workers." This is the condition that is transforming the Yankee Land of the South into a veritable hell on earth for Whites and Blacks who are of the disinherited landless.

AT last we have found an appropriate name for the men in control of affairs at Washington. There is a type of antelope at the Central Park Zoo called aoudads which race around in circles. Recently when the eclipse

of the moon occurred they accentuated their speed along a circular course, though the aoudads are likely to run around in circles with no excuse whatever. The same is true of the Washington species. No eclipse of the moon or sun frightens them really; the eclipse of industry only sets them to work with pen and paper figuring how if they had been in charge of the matter there would have been no eclipse.

CONTESTANTS for the Big Award are pressing one another very closely now. The reader will ask, "What award?" It is the award that awaits the one who suggests the most original remedy for poverty and depressions. Out first choice is Roger Babson. Most of us will remember the remedy suggested by Dean Swift for Ireland's troubles, which was the killing of all new born babies. The "gloomy Dean" was not as serious as Mr. Babson appears to be, nor as thorough. But let the Sage of Babson Park speak for himself: He says, advocating birth control for families on relief: "The very fact that a family is on relief shows that too many of that group exist. (sic). Hence I would use every decent means of reducing the number until the group no longer needed relief. That is just ordinary common sense." Then he adds with a self-satisfied air: "The whole question of relieving unemployment is so simple that I cannot understand why any one will permit religious or other prejudices to block the situation."

THE whole question may be simple indeed but Mr. Babson has not come within miles of solving it. He further elaborates his plan, which includes the "drafting of workers into industry on the same principles that men were drafted out of industry during the World War. Every employer should add to his payroll one or more persons from each family in distress, and should not be allowed to discharge any on the payroll without the consent of some impartial board like the draft boards."

IT is significant of current confusion that suggestions like the above receive attention in the public prints. Mr. Babson evidently thinks that there are such persons as "employers of labor" who pay wages regardless of the demand for the product. How glad they would be to be able to take on one or more employees! Mr. Babson has been an unsparing critic of the New Deal but he is even more at sea than the supporters of that strange policy. We think Mr. Babson qualifies for the Big Award. We cannot imagine any profounder nonsense.

MR. WALTER LIPPMAN is little better in his reasoning than Roger Babson, though he is more suave and a little less ignorant. In one of his articles in the *Herald-Tribune* he says, speaking of the planning programme: "There are of course many who think that artificial measures are never warranted. They may

be right, though I think that our situation in 1933 called for them. But in public affairs, as in medicine, the resort to artificial stimulants, even when it is necessary, is dangerous and habit-forming. The good doctor and the good statesman are those who know how big a dose of stimulants is necessary, and, above all, when to stop giving them."

REASONING by analogy is always dangerous and especially so in this illustration. The economic man does not need stimulants but a restoration of the natural functioning. Every good physician ministering to his patient considers this first. The economic man is bound hand and foot with tariffs, taxes and monopolistic exactions. His normal functions are interfered with. He is a mighty poor physician who in such a crisis recommends stimulants rather than freeing the patient who is being choked to death. Why not try the experiment of unbinding him?

WE think Mr. Lippman has a vague consciousness of this. We instance, "They may be right," followed by the phrase, "even when necessary." This is a deliberate begging of the question for if those opposing artificial stimulants "may be right" the necessity vanishes along with the rest of the argument. That is a kind of careless writing which is habitual with Mr. Lippman and does much to destroy our faith in the soundness of his reasoning.

IN the *Atlantic* for August is an article by Abraham Flexner on Private Fortunes and the Public Future, in which is given a list of the most notable benefactions in the establishment of hospitals, colleges, etc. Were we inclined to be captious we might question the title "Private Fortunes," since all fortunes are private. There is only one *public* fortune, the economic rent of land—all other fortunes are private. Mr. Flexner seems to think that there is need of some agency or power "to check greed or folly." We may remind Mr. Flexner of Herbert Spencer's statement that the only result of laws designed to protect fools against the consequences of their folly has been to fill the world with fools. But a far more important consideration is that the great fortunes out of which these benefactions have come are for the most part the accumulated loot of privilege and monopoly, and, to an overwhelming extent, the privilege of land monopoly. Had these enormous fortunes been allowed to remain in the hands of the people where they belong, communities would have built more magnificent hospitals and more extensive colleges than any we see today as the result of private benefactions. Mr. Flexner has a few flings at the laissez faire doctrine, which seems to be the habit just now of those who do not understand what it is all about.

HOW plausible seem these attacks on the laissez faire principle which Mr. Flexner tells us is "forever closed." Yet when was it open? Free competition against which superficial writers fulminate, has never existed in the world. Monopoly of the natural resources has everywhere interfered with the normal law of competition, and thus against the law of cooperation, which is its complement and not its opposite. With government monopolies everywhere, how idle it is to attribute the ills of society to the exactly opposite policy!

AND speaking of "private fortunes" reminds us of the "share the wealth" slogan heard so frequently nowadays. But whose wealth? Granted that what is needed is a more equitable distribution, is there no ethical discrimination to be observed? Are we to ignore the origin of these fortunes which we propose so lightly to share among us? What right have we to them—how much greater right than the present possessors?

DICK TURPIN had a political economy like that. It made him quite popular for a time, but looking at him in retrospect his code of morals does not seem quite so inviting? Of course, his practices included one of the cardinal principles of Mr. Lippman and other thinkers when discussing taxation without any consideration at all of "the benefits received" theory. Of course, too, there are times when Dick Turpin's somewhat reprehensible conduct seems lily-white when compared to the practices of governments. Turpin seems a somewhat gallant figure when compared with the sneaking practices of our official representatives and their greedy snarls. "Share the wealth," indeed! That has been the cry of every highwayman and brigand from Robin Hood to Dillinger.

IT is impossible to imagine a greater robber than the government itself. It has "shared the wealth" with a vengeance. Every purchaser of a twenty cent article in many states is robbed of a part of his purchase. Even the mother who buys milk for her babes is robbed in New Jersey, so that the receiver of economic rent (the only public wealth) may escape his contribution to the cost of government which itself creates these values. Dick Turpin would not have done that!

THE great robbery of which these lesser robberies are but the sequels and consequences is the robbery of the earth. Against this robbery the great minds of all the ages have protested, Moses, Gregory the Great, Tom Paine, Carlyle, Rousseau, Tolstoy, Henry George and many others. Only the last offered a definite solution. But the robbery continues. With the earth closed, or open only on the terms of the lords of the earth, unem-

ployment, poverty and misery result. They are the inevitable results of the system which denies man a place to work. Not only is this a challenge to labor, it is equally a challenge to capital. It is time that capital and labor awoke. These stupid, snarling cries of "share the wealth" should be a warning to capital, to the possessors of wealth, and to labor. The remedy is theirs if they will but take it. To the wealthy, the conservation of their fortunes, the security of their possessions; to labor, the freedom to work—these call for the application of the only remedy that is safe, sane and easily brought about. Public wealth for public purposes, private wealth as the sacred property of those who create it. And all this to be effected by the mere shifting of the tax burden. Is it not worth trying?

## "What Are We Going to Do About It?"

WHEN the complete panorama of human justice reveals itself to the student of "Progress and Poverty," he asks with an impetuosity born of knowledge and conviction:

"What are we going to do about it?"

That question has confronted every teacher of Henry George. It is a question which bespeaks not only a understanding of the fundamental economics on which the proposal to socialize ground rent is based, but also an earnest desire to see this reform enacted into law so that involuntary poverty, that scourge of humanity shall be abolished from this earth. The riddle of the Sphinx has been solved. Why wait?

In attempting to answer that question every teacher reaches back into memory for a satisfying reply. He thinks of the time when he, too, having closed the great book with that ecstatic feeling that comes to one to whom a great truth has been revealed, asked the same question. He recalls the many plans and campaigns, the speeches made, the pamphlets written and distributed, the congresses held and the resolutions passed—every thing that has been done "about it" since the time of Henry George. He finds no adequate answer, because he knows that every plan attempted has fallen far short of the goal. He realizes that this failure to advance the cause so grounded in reason and justice has not been due to any fallacy in its logic, nor yet to lack of ability or self-sacrifice on the part of many who have devoted their lives to it. The reason that the Single Tax reform has not advanced must be due to lack of public demand for it, which in turn must be ascribed to lack of public knowledge of it.

The late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry George School of Social Science, realized that widespread education must be a prerequisite for any successful attempt to enact Single Tax legislation. He arrived at this con-

clusion only after many years of active work in various Single Tax endeavors. He was the kind of devotee who never failed to lend a helping hand in any effort to advance the cause. Yet, some years before he passed on he realized that this sporadic expounding of Henry George's philosophy could only arouse interest in a few listeners, and that complete conviction could come only with thorough knowledge. And he further realized that the short-cuts of political action in which he had taken so active a part did not succeed because there had not been a sufficient background of education.

### WE MUST EDUCATE

But why, it may be asked, is education so necessary to this movement? Many reform movements have been attempted, and some successfully brought about, with mere propaganda—speeches and literature. The Abolitionists of the middle of last century, and the Prohibitionists at the beginning of this one, both saw their proposals put into law without any educational campaign, depending entirely upon propaganda literature and extensive speech-making. The reason for this is that they had nothing to teach. Their reforms were based entirely upon sentiment. It is a far cry from "Uncle Tom's Cabin" to "Progress and Poverty." And then emagoguery has a quicker appeal than reason.

Why, then, cannot the Single Tax be advocated in the same way? Surely, we can appeal to the hearts of men with our proposal to abolish poverty, with all the social maladjustments that arise from it. The very beauty of "Progress and Poverty" is in its ethical approach to economics. The desire to destroy the cruel system of landlordism that is gnawing at the vitals of civilization is a human impulse, not confined to the erudite. And so on.

Quite true. But it so happens that in order for us to reach the hearts of men we must dislodge from their minds certain erroneous conceptions which have been accepted as true and necessary for many centuries. The iniquity of landlordism is apparent only to those who have some idea of the function of economic rent. The populace looks upon landlordism not as a necessary evil, but as a beneficial system. A tax on land values is to the average citizen no different in effect from a tax on labor products; and the farmer, even the tenant farmer, is quite sure we Single Taxers (if he has ever heard of us) want to "take his land away from him." When we speak of wealth as the thing, and of land, money and bonds as another thing, we are running contrary not only to what seems obvious to the man in the street, but also to what he has been taught to believe since the beginning of time. Nay, we are speaking a language that is foreign even to the student of "economics" in our universities. To him our differentiation between land and capital is as unbound as it is bewildering.

Our problem is, therefore, primarily educational. It

would be foolhardy to venture an opinion as to just how the Single Tax will be written into our statute books. That eventually we must enter the political arena with our proposal is quite evident; for we ask for a change in our fiscal laws, and that can only be brought about by a counting of ballots. Whether we shall gain our end by separate party action, or through referenda or initiative petitions, it is almost useless to speculate. What the precedent political conditions will be is also speculative. Some there are who claim that a social upheaval, even communism, will precede the Single Tax, and it is plausible to assume that a land value tax will be part of a general reform movement which will include many things foreign and antagonistic to our philosophy. In any event, it is certain that no matter what form of political action we engage in, or what political situation arises that will make possible the enactment of land value taxation, the extent of our influence or success will depend on the number of citizens who are thoroughly familiar with the philosophy of Henry George. Even if through some subterfuge or freakish political situation we should be able to have the Single Tax written into the fundamental law of a political subdivision of the country it is questionable whether the result would be desirable; for, without the intelligent vigilance of a reasonable number of informed citizens, the landlords could make such a law appear ineffective and even harmful, so that our reform would seem to be a "failure," would be discredited, and would be retarded for many years, perhaps centuries. The price of liberty is intelligent, no less than eternal, vigilance.

But, though only through widespread education can we hope to inaugurate and maintain our reform, it must not be assumed that our problem is to teach "Progress and Poverty" to fifty-one per cent of the people. That would be an impossible task. It is a fact that an organized minority that knows what it wants can dominate a large crowd; but the minority must be of sufficient size to make its voice heard. Neither the Abolitionists nor the Prohibitionists ever approached the proportions of a majority in their successful campaigns. Just how many Single Taxers we should have to assure permanent success is very difficult to say. It has been estimated that one hundred thousand is the number we need in this country. This is not an insuperable goal. In a comparatively few years, the concerted efforts of all those who now believe in our philosophy can achieve this result.

### THE PLAN

The plan evolved by the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science is as follows: To organize as quickly as possible One Thousand Classes in "Progress and Poverty" in various parts of the country, wherever teachers can be located. Experience has shown that between ten to twenty students make an ideal class.

The course is completed in ten weeks. Therefore, allowing for unforeseen delays and vocation periods, each teacher can complete three classes in a year, accounting for approximately forty graduates. Thus, forty thousand will have been added to our number in one year. It must be born in mind, however, that the increasing momentum of this campaign is a factor that makes any estimate of numbers impractical. Every graduate becomes a potential teacher, or at any rate a solicitor of students. Every class in a larger community becomes the nucleus for a full-time school. Among our students are many who come in contact with large groups in their daily work—such as school teachers, labor leaders, social workers, newspaper men. In proportion as we have more of this type of student the greater will be the acceleration of our campaign. Nor must it be forgotten that numbers attract attention, and that activity arrests public notice; as we progress in our educational work the public press, even where is it antagonistic, will aid in filling up our class rooms.

When a well-conceived and fundamentally sound plan is determined upon it is futile to attempt to foresee every eventuality and to outline every detail of procedure in advance. It is quite possible that educational avenues other than the class method will be available, such as the radio, correspondence courses, and the use of newspaper and magazine space. This will be dependent upon our financial resources, which, of course, will be enhanced with the increase in our numbers. Nor must we overlook the possibility of our own classes being augmented by classes in established educational institutions, for not only will our own teacher students carry the message of economic justice to their schools, but the increase in our numbers will compel the professional teachers of economics to at least explain Henry George's theory in their class rooms. Nay, the very problem of increasing poverty, the inadequacy of the nostrums that are being offered, the clamor for a real cure will force public interest to our fundamental reform as the increasing number of our graduates call attention to it. It is inevitable, also, that the impatience of Single Taxers with the slow and steady progress of education will result in attempting political action; while such action cannot possibly be successful at this time, or even in the immediate future, it cannot but be helpful to the school movement because of the very publicity which political action always attracts.

So, as we embark on this great educational venture, we cannot foresee what storms we shall encounter or what favorable winds will help us on our course. We know that our bark has a sound keel and that it will get us to our port if only we are steadfast in our purpose. Anchors aweigh. Let's go.

#### WHAT "I" MUST DO

For the individual who, having absorbed the full truth of "Progress and Poverty," asks himself, "What am I

going to do about it?" The answer must be found primarily in his own resources, his abilities and his limitations, his spiritual make-up. Genius should not, cannot, be harnessed. Men of strength and vision make their own plans. But, it is not amiss to suggest to every graduate some thoughts on how he can cooperate with the general campaign of the school, as well as some avenues of individual expression which will advance the cause.

First, and foremost, every believer in the philosophy of Henry George should appoint himself a committee of one to see that his school or class is never lacking in students. No matter what kind of propaganda work he engages in, the thought uppermost in his mind should be to persuade everyone he comes in contact with to study "Progress and Poverty." No Single Taxer is true to his principles who does not enroll at least five students a year. With that first item in our credo faithfully adhered to the educational campaign cannot possibly fail.

Secondly, he should try to increase the number of classes in his community. Small classes are most effective because they encourage discussion. Therefore, when a class numbers more than twenty, possibly fifteen is a better number, a new class should be formed. And in larger cities, where the inconvenience of travel is a consideration, it is desirable to organize classes in various parts of the town. Sometimes it is possible to persuade a group of friends to attend a class in some home, while it might be impossible to have them travel downtown to a classroom. Business and professional people can be induced to join a class of their own, meeting in a convenient office, while the thought of attending a school at their ages may seem puerile. Groups of serious minded women, their appetites for social gatherings somewhat jaded by the vacuity of their previous endeavors, can be appealed to on the ground of personal enlightenment and greater public service. Men's clubs and church groups offer opportunity for classes. Nor should we overlook adult educational schools, vocational schools, business colleges, giving them an opportunity to widen their scope by offering their students a course in fundamental economics.

Thirdly, every student of the Single Tax should prepare himself to teach. As the number of classes increases the demand for teachers will be a strain on our forces. It is of prime importance, therefore, that every follower of Henry George consider himself a possible teacher and be prepared to be called or to call himself into service. While it is true that many effective teachers have been men whose only acquaintance with our philosophy has been gained from a thorough understanding of "Progress and Poverty," it is always helpful if the teacher has studied all of George's books, especially the "Science of Political Economy" and "Protection or Free Trade." Such books as Professor Geiger's "Philosophy of Henry George," Louis F. Post's "Prophet of San Francisco," Patrick Dove's "Theory of Human Progression," and



others, all help to broaden the teacher's knowledge and thus enable him to bring to the class an erudition that is impressive, and a mental experience that enables him to cope with class-room questions. But, such wider study is only helpful, not necessary. Perhaps an ability to interpret political and economic affairs of the day in the light of Henry George's philosophy is more important, for the average class-room question is based on current events. The Henry George School of Social Science publishes a "Teachers' Manual," with questions, answers, and suggestions on how to conduct classes, that is an invaluable pedagogical help to every teacher. For purposes of uniformity the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science require authorized teachers to use this manual as a guide.

Thus, the answer to "What am I going to do about it" is quite definite. First, get students; second, organize classes; third, be a teacher. If every follower of Henry George will follow this personal programme faithfully the success of the educational campaign is assured. And upon the success of this campaign depends the success of any political endeavor that the movement may eventually decide to engage in.

#### WHAT "I" MIGHT DO

To those who feel inclined to enlarge upon their personal activities, there is ever so much work that can be done. For the orator these are unbounded opportunities. In these days of stress, when the minds of men, oppressed by the ever-increasing problems of poverty, bewildered by the confusion of illogical nostrums that are offered for their solution, and faith in long-established concepts of government shaken by innovations which run contrary to reason, are open to any proposal which might appear to be more in harmony with logic and experience, the orator who can effectively demonstrate a natural order in our politico-economic life would indeed be given a hearing. There are ever so many audiences that are prepared to listen.

And while we are on this topic of platform-teaching of the Single Tax, there is a thought that should be considered by the organized groups in our movement. Speakers' bureaus should be established in every city for the purpose of conducting regular campaigns for securing opportunities to speak. It is easier for a secretary to "sell" the services of the orator than for the latter to solicit engagements for himself.

For those who are literarily inclined, for the research student, for those who can wield the pen effectively, there are limitless opportunities. Such work must perforce be purely personal in character; no organization can foster creative thinking.

The Single Tax movie scenario has not yet been written. Nor the novel that shall popularize the land question as "Uncle Tom's Cabin" popularized the slavery question. We need editorial writers who will apply the acid

test of Natural Law to the news events of the day. No one has yet written a book showing how landlordism and its corollary, restrictive tariffs, caused that crazy conflagration, "The World War." History needs to be re-written in the light of Henry George's philosophy.

In the field of economics we need a comparative study of all the schools, demonstrating their fallacies as well as their conflicting ideas, so as to further enhance the grandeur, simplicity and cogency of the system taught by Henry George. We need graphic charts, based upon factual findings, to determine the irrefutable deductions of Henry George. For instance, a chart showing how wages and interest rise as rent falls, and vice versa. Or, a chart showing the relation between the volume of charity dispensed in the city of New York and the rise in land value. The ratio of bankruptcies to increased land values, in number and in dollar volume; the increase of farm tenantry; the concentration of mineral land ownership and the consequent rise of monopolies; a comparison of land values and mortgages; land booms that preceded panics; one could go on almost indefinitely naming subject matter to which the research student could well apply himself in the effort to prove factually and by charts the effect of private land ownership on economic and social phenomena.

The legalistic and political aspects of land ownership open a wide field for the lawyer-authors in our movement. We really should have definite knowledge of the legal hurdles it will some day be necessary to overcome so that land valuation laws may stand the test of court action. The legal history of private land ownership would make interesting and intelligent material.

It is not necessary to speculate further into the fields of inquiry for subjects on which the student and the literary-minded could engage with profit. Enough has been indicated to show the vastness of the intellectual mine in which these minds can explore for more than one answer to the question, "What am I going to do about it."

#### IT'S UP TO YOU

The task is yours. It is not a question of "what are *we* going to do about it?" but "what am *I* going to do about it?" The problem is an individual one, and its solution is directly dependent upon, and in exact ratio to, the effort and ability of every one who has acquired a knowledge of Henry George to spread this knowledge. Do not wait for somebody else. Do not waste time in praying for a leader. "Progress and Poverty" is your guide, Henry George is your inspiration, and you are the disciple, on whom the mantle has fallen. Go forth into the highways and the by-ways and teach the gospel of economic liberty.—FRANK CHODOROV.

**T**O accommodate the report of the Congress and other matter which should find place, this issue comprises forty pages instead of the usual thirty-two.

## The Single Tax\*

By HENRY GEORGE

**T**HE Single Tax is NOT a tax on land. It is a tax on land value—on that value which attaches to land irrespective of improvements in or on it; that value which remained in the land of Johnstown after every improvement had been hurled into awful heaps of debris; that value left in the business part of Lynn lately swept by fire; that value which remains in a centrally located city lot after the building on it has become of so little value that it is bought only to be torn down.

It may be said: "What is the use of making this distinction? You would not speak of taxing house values or ship values; but of taxing houses or ships. In the United States when we speak of taxing land we mean taxing it according to value. We do tax some things specifically, but land we usually tax by value." This is true. And it is worth noting. For it shows that instead of being a new tax, which would require a tremendous new taxing machine and a fundamental change in our government, the Single Tax is really a tax we now collect in the tax on real estate. All that is new in it is the SINGLE. The tax itself we already have. To make it the SINGLE tax we have only to abolish other taxes.

But as to the necessity for the distinction. There is a difference between taxing land and taxing land values that does not exist between taxing such things as ships and houses and taxing their values—a difference that, although of no importance in ordinary thought or speech, becomes all-important when we come to reason on the effects of taxation. A tax on house or ship values would fall on all houses or ships—or at least on all that have not been abandoned and are yet in use. But a tax on land values would not fall on all land, nor yet on all land in use, for value does not attach to all land, nor to all land in use.

A tax on land—that is to say, a specific tax on all land—WOULD become a condition to, and a restriction on, the use of land; WOULD hamper the use of the natural factor of production; WOULD fall on farmers; WOULD become a tax on labor; and WOULD increase prices by increasing the cost of production. These are valid objections to a tax on land. It is a tax on what in the terminology of political economy is styled rent—that value, namely, which, irrespective of the value of improvements, attaches to SOME land with the growth of population and social development; that premium which the user as user must pay to the owner as owner,

\*NOTE:—This article, written by Henry George, and published in *The Century*, July, 1890, in answer to the attack, written by Edward Atkinson, entitled "A Single Tax on Land" in the same issue of the magazine, is here reproduced and slightly abridged by Anna George de Mille.

either in one payment (purchase money) or in annual payments (rent), for permission to use land of superior excellence.

The Single Tax, therefore, could NOT fall on all land. It could fall only on valuable land, or land of superior excellence. Hence it could not restrict production, or lessen the use of land, or diminish the earnings of labor or capital. It could only take the premium which the user as user must pay to the owner as owner; and since this would discourage speculation and make it easier to get land for use, it would tend to increase production and to increase the earnings of labor and capital.

In point of exchangeable power, or as items in the wealth of individuals, there is no difference between a given value of land and a like value of grain, metals, cattle, clothing, machinery, tools, or ships; but observation will show wide differences in their nature, their genesis, their laws, and their relations. As an example of the valuable things whose common character is that they are produced by labor, and which in political economy are alone properly classed as wealth, let us take a thing of the kind that in common thought and legal terminology comes closest to land—a building.

Here is a building which, irrespective of the land it stands on, is worth \$5,000; and here is a piece of land which, without any improvement in or on it, is also worth \$5,000. These values are equivalent, representing to the owner equal powers of obtaining other things in exchange. But—

The value of the building attached to it originally, from the moment it came into existence. The land had no original value. There is no building in the United States that did not have a value when first erected. But, though the land has existed for geologic ages, there is no land in the United States that has had any value for more than a few hundred years; while there is much land now valuable that has only had a value for a few years, or even for a few months.

The value of a building lessens with time, since with time buildings decay. And in growing and improving communities improvements that cheapen the cost of building, and changes in the kinds of buildings demanded, also tend to lessen the value of existing buildings. But land is not subject to decay or change of fashion. Nor can decrease in the cost of production lessen its value, for land is not produced by man, but was here before he came. So far from diminishing with time, the value of land in growing and improving communities tends steadily to increase. In all our growing cities there is no building that is worth as much as it was a year ago, but land as a rule is worth more.

In the case of the building, what determines value is the cost of producing such a building. In the case of land, it is its relative advantage for use over other land—the final element in which is its location in respect to population. The value of the building has thus indi-

vidual exertion as its basis. It represents the present value of labor embodied in the building. The value of land, on the other hand, has social growth as its basis. It does not represent the value of any individual exertion, but the present value of an appropriation—for the ownership of land cannot be obtained by producing, but only by appropriating what already exists. The labor of the individual exerted on land may produce value, but it will be a value inhering in the product or improvement the labor makes, not in the land itself. That value comes only by growth of population and social advance. A man may work or spend on land to any amount; but no matter how valuable his improvements, the land itself acquires no value except as the community around it grows and improves, or access to larger populations is opened. He may do nothing at all, and, as social growth and improvement go on, the value of his land will increase. He may be an absentee, an infant, an imbecile—social growth will still add value to his land.

Thus in taxing buildings or other products of labor we take from the individual what individual exertion produced, thus impairing the natural reward of exertion, and checking the springs of general wealth. But in taxing land values we take from the individual what is brought by social growth; we simply apply to the use of the community what non-producers would otherwise appropriate. In no wise do we lessen the rewards of exertion or check the springs of general wealth. On the contrary, in applying to public use the power of drawing on the general wealth which pertains to the ownership of land we discourage ownership without use, and thus prevent natural opportunities for production from being withheld from use.

Here it may be asked, as the Socialists ask, "Why should not the whole results of production be left to those who take part in production?"

The sufficient answer is, that there is no possible way of leaving to labor and capital that part of the product that constitutes economic rent. This setting aside, as it were, of a certain portion of the results of production which MAY be taken by the community, but otherwise WILL be taken by non-producers, is a result of advance in civilization. It arises from the necessity, which comes with the higher uses of land, of giving individual possession, and from differences in the capabilities of land. Even where the owner and the user of land are the same person, economic rent exists. Where the demand for wheat causes the cultivation of land that with a certain application of labor and capital will yield fourteen bushels an acre, the owning farmer whose land, otherwise equal, will yield to the same application twenty bushels will have an advantage—not as a cultivator, but as a land-owner. The power of getting six bushels more with the same exertion will inhere not in his labor nor in his capital, but in his land. He may cease to take any part in production and still get the equivalent of the six bushels

by renting the land; or if he does not choose to rent, or is prohibited from doing so, he can get from the user who takes his place an equivalent sum or obligation. So, if a site in the center of a city will enable a store-keeper to get a larger net profit than will one on the outskirts, a separable advantage will attach to this site, which he who has the right of use can rent or sell.

These advantages attach to land; they cannot go to labor or capital. Where they go to a laborer or a capitalist, they go to him not as laborer or capitalist, but as land-owner or possessor and give him an advantage above what his labor and capital can give. The whole product can go to labor—or to labor and capital, if they both engage in production—only where social development is so rude that no special advantage attaches to one location over another, and the land is treated as a common. In civilized societies, where there are great and increasing differences in the advantages of location, it is only on the poorest land in use that labor and capital can retain the full results of production. Any location where land has superior capability must command a premium which labor and capital must pay. This premium may be taken in taxation on land values for the use of the community, as we Single Tax men propose; or it may be left to land-owners, as for the most part it is now left. But it cannot go to labor and capital. There is no way of leaving it to them.

Let me illustrate: In newspaper offices where union rules prevail the price of composition is based on the average work, and steps are taken to secure to every workman his fair chance of "fat" and "lean." But it is sometimes desirable to permit special men to set particular kinds of "fat matter." In such cases those who set this matter pay a premium to the others by way of equalization. To abolish these premiums, and to allow the men who set the "fat" to retain the full amount of their bills, would not be to give them the wages of their labor, but to give them the advantages of monopoly. To put the theory of the Single Tax in terms every printer will understand, it is to take "department premiums" for the use of the "chapel."

Labor, capital, and land are the three factors of production, the first two being different forms of the human factor, the last being the natural factor. Labor and capital must have a reward for their exertion or they cannot continue to exert themselves, or, indeed, to exist. But Nature claims no reward. Land is her free gift to man, her gratuitous service. The primary division of the product is therefore between these two, or into wages and interest. And this (monopoly eliminated) continues to be the division on what in political economy is styled the margin of production, or the poorest land in use—land on which labor and capital can produce only their ordinary returns. But where labor and capital are willing to work on land of a certain quality—or, what is the same thing, can from their product on it

obtain the ordinary rate of wages and interest—then that law of competition that tends to bring wages and interest to a common level will enable the owner of land of superior quality to claim the excess which the exertion of labor and capital will yield on that, over what they could obtain on the poorer land. And as the earnings of labor and capital must always be fixed by what they can obtain on the poorest land worked, while the growth and development of society tends to bring out higher and higher capabilities in particular lands, the portion of the results of production that land-owners can claim tends constantly to increase with the advance of civilization.

It is this part of the increment of wealth—the part called by John Stuart Mill the “unearned increment,” because it now goes to, non-producers—that we propose by the Single Tax to take for public needs in place of the taxes now levied on industry, enterprise, and thrift.

Is not this clearly the wise and just way of raising public revenues?

*(To be Continued)*

## Action!

**I**T seems unthinkable that any Henry-Georgian should object to organization and action. Suppose mistakes are made. They are inevitable, but in spite of our mistakes the right implement can only be found by trying and will be found at last, and the cause will triumph sooner than from a course in inactivity.

Are we to be raised to the seventh heaven every time we read a Georgist paper or book and then do nothing about it! It would seem that we have wasted enough steam in that way to have got somewhere long ago. But we are all playing the part of lone scouts with none of the enthusiasm of camaraderie. The exhilaration of belonging to a great national body would be of untold value to the cause.

The appeal from the Land League in your last issue came as a surprise to the writer who had not heard of its existence. The long name of American Association for Scientific Taxation seems unnecessary and misleading. Why not simply The American Land League!

The appeal contained two very valuable proposals—first that no dues or obligations except political cooperation be imposed and second that we depend on systematic petitioning of legislatures. A volume of petitions rolling up every year in every State would put our cause squarely before the American people.

LEWIS H. CLARK, Sodus, N. Y.

## A Funny World

**W**E worry about the morale of the workingman who has to go on relief, because we know that he himself worries. Any decent man prefers to earn the money he spends, and feels himself degraded if he has to take without giving something in exchange.

But nobody worries about the landowner who takes in a big income without earning it. Least of all does he himself worry, about his morale or anything else, even though he is taking without giving anything in exchange.

It's a funny world!—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

## The Keynote Convention Speech, 1940

By HON. B. A. PARTYMAN

## A Story of Tax Relief for Land and of New Deal Prosperity

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

Author of “The Economic Basis of Tax Reform”

Mr. Chairman; Fellow Delegates to this Great Convention:

**A**S we meet here to deliberate on the selection of a leader in the campaign which lies before us, and on the formulation of a programme to be carried out during the next four years, it is eminently fitting that we pause a little while and pass a backward glance at the accomplishments and progress of all the states and of the nation during the years, since 1932, that our party has guided the destinies of America. There is a unity in the legislation of the states and of the national government during this period, which can be explained only by the fact that the great party which we represent has guided and directed both.

It sometimes happens that fundamental principles of wide application, which only an insignificant fraction of the people have previously understood, seem to burst suddenly on the popular mind and come to their full flowering in policy during a comparatively few years. Then there ensues a period of material and cultural development which succeeding generations look back upon as a golden age of human progress.

The great twin principles, that high land values are the foundation of prosperity and that taxes on land should be reduced in order to make land values high, have long been understood by the intelligent and substantial few. But it was not until seven or eight years ago, when our great party was waging its successful struggle for control of the national and state governments and during the opening months of the new administration, that these two fundamental principles began really to permeate the understanding of the great multitude. During these critical and significant months, however, it became increasingly clear to an ever increasing proportion of the citizenry that tax relief for land was the one fundamental reform for which all really good citizens, and certainly all landowning citizens, ought to work. For, clearly, the more that was paid in rent to landowners by the remainder of the people for permission to live and to work on the earth in any locations having community-produced situation advantages, and the less of this rent that was taken in taxation by the public, the higher would be the sale value of the land. And if the land was worth more, then each community and the nation would be more prosperous.

There had been, many long years before, a strange

and rather obstreperous sect, sometimes called Single Taxers, who had treated these great principles with disdain and even with derision. The rents paid to landowners, one of these deriders had said, benefited the best of the people the same way weasels in the henroost benefit the poultry farmer. Another of the Single Taxers had got the habit of annoying prominent and substantial citizens who had developed their communities through collecting rents, by making them listen to a story about a certain Mrs. D. Mentid whose cellar was infested with rats which, she said, were making her daily and hourly more prosperous. Mrs. Mentid would often speak rapturously of her rats. For, obviously, she would say, the more of her potatoes, turnips, carrots, cheeses and hams were consumed by the rats, the fatter and stronger and so the more valuable the rats would be. And if the rats were fatter and stronger—and therefore worth more—Mrs Mentid would be correspondingly more prosperous.

But, fortunately, the membership and the influence of this sect had latterly greatly declined, so much so that many of the literary intelligentsia of parlor pink proivities, who write for the high-brow magazines, such as the *New Republic* and the *Nation*, said the species was extinct, like the dinosaur and the pterodactyl and the like, and its philosophy out of date and not worth the attention of such intellectual leaders as themselves. It was very discreditable for an intellectual to harbor ideas which other intellectuals have found to be out of date. So a large part of the intelligentsia, as well as an overwhelming majority of the entire people, were fast coming to realize that taxes on land should by no means be increased, as the Single Taxers had urged, but should, on the contrary, be greatly lowered.

So now in all of the states the people began to demand earnestly and insistently and even clamorously that the taxes on land and sites should be reduced, in order to have more of the annual community-produced rent of land in the possession of the owners of land, and thereby make the land worth more and thereby make the states and the nation more prosperous.

Not only were landowners in general—the really leading and substantial citizens of the nation—favorable to the change; but especially were the owners of vacant lots in favor of it, for, as they said, they were deriving no income from these lots while holding them out of use and ought not to have to pay taxes on property which was yielding them nothing. Furthermore, a large number of the public school teachers, school superintendents and other public employees realized full well that the influential public opinion favored the reduction and even the abolition of taxation on the community-produced value of land, and that increased salaries could come only from other sources, so they were heartily in favor of other sources for taxation and of the reduction of taxation on land. Parent-teacher associations joined

in the crusade to relieve land of taxes, so that they could get more money for the schools and increase thereby the intelligence of the citizenry on such matters as taxation.

To secure the necessary revenues to run the various state and local governments, taxes were levied on the salaries and wages that the people earned by their work and on the capital they saved and constructed and the income from it, on such luxuries of the pampered and idle rich as moving picture entertainments, athletic contests, cigarettes, soft drinks, gasoline and, in many of the states, on all retail sales.

The result was a great tidal wave of prosperity, proving that the fears and predictions of opposition calamity-howlers had been groundless. For these calamity-howlers had overlooked the innate mulishness of the people and were therefore entirely unprepared for the really stimulating effects of the new taxes. The taxes on what people earned by their work goaded them to work harder and more cheerfully and to do much more work, so the country became a veritable hive of industry. The taxes on the capital they constructed and on the income from it instigated them to save and to construct more capital, so thrift became a national trait and the increased capital made industry much more productive. The fact that home owners had to pay more taxes when they improved their homes than when they did not, a time-honored American custom, incited them to do more improving and to buy more lumber and paint, more trees and shrubs, more grass seed and lawn mowers. The taxes on moving picture entertainments aroused among the poorer people a frantic eagerness to attend the movies and thus stimulated the building of theatres and the making of films. The taxes on soft drinks made it so expensive to live comfortably in the cities, and especially in the slums, during the heat of summer, that the poorer people were tempted to buy more second-hand cars and more gasoline and to take their families to the seashore and to the mountains and to various inland lakes for the summer months. But the gasoline tax prevented this. So they stayed in the cities and worked harder in order to be able to pay the taxes, and therefore became thirstier, and therefore consumed more soft drinks, as well as other drinks, and therefore stimulated the employment of soda-fountain clerks and the manufacture of beverages and of bottles and glasses. Finally, the taxes on all retail sales, by leaving, for industry and wages in all lines of production, a smaller per cent of the consumer's dollar, fired the working class with a new and driving ambition—a sort of holy zeal, or righteous rage—and thus made them more prosperous than they had been before the sales taxes were levied.

There was, indeed, one disrupting factor in this scene of joyful activity. The common people in each of the states were so enthusiastic about the substitution of the sales taxes and other taxes levied on them, for taxes on the community-produced situation value of land, that when-

ever a state senator or representative who had voted for the new taxes appeared on the street, all of the day laborers and mechanics and clerks and housewives burst quite spontaneously into cheers and rushed from their work in the sewers and factories and stores and kitchens and pressed about the statesman to congratulate him and themselves and to shake his hand. And the great statesmen in the state legislatures were so pleased at this that they appeared daily and even hourly in public places where the common people could see them. So the business activity resulting from the taxes was not so active as it might have been. But, after all, the disruption of business on these occasions brought diversion and excitement to the working classes, and aroused their patriotism and their pride in their state governments, and so protected and preserved them from the wiles of communists and other dangerous radicals. In fact, one of the very purposes of the new taxes on sales and the like was to make the working people more contented and stop the spread of communist propaganda among them.

But the really important cause of the increasing prosperity was the country-wide reduction of taxation on the community-produced situation value of land. This welcome tax relief for land enabled the owners of land to keep far more than before of the rent which non-owners paid them for permission to live and to work in those parts of the United States where community development made labor effective and life reasonably tolerable, and the fact that the owners could keep more of the rent made their land worth more and so greatly increased prosperity. Reducing the tax on land reduced the penalty of holding land out of use for speculation and made it easier for owners of unimproved land to keep it unimproved until they could get a reasonably high price from those who wanted to use it for industries and homes. The owners were no longer compelled to pay as high taxes as before on land which, since they were holding it vacant and idle, was yielding them nothing. So, in a little while, it came about that approximately half of the building lots in the principal cities and their suburbs, certainly more than before, and many of the mines and potential power sites, and more agricultural land, were being held out of use by speculators who confidently expected the land to rise in value. This increased the demand for the remaining land for industry and to build homes and thereby made land values throughout the nation higher and the people richer.

Although the indirect taxes on many working farmers and on the poorer home owners made their total tax burden heavier than if just the situation rent of their land had been taxed, yet they were richer because their land was worth more. Even if they could not enjoy so good a living, could seldom afford to attend the movies and could have hardly any of the real comforts and luxuries of life, still they were richer because their land would sell for more.

In the central business districts of the big cities, an increasing number of the well-located sites came to have values of several million dollars each, and all the more intelligent people, such as the owners of these sites recognized such values as an evidence of general prosperity.

Enthusiasm for the new policy was infectious and spread rapidly. Those whose great intellects had enabled them to foresee the adoption of the tax relief system—as well as to urge it—and who had therefore bought plenty of land while it was still cheap, were now rich, and they could afford the leisure to help the rest of the people understand the advantages of relieving land of taxation. Some of the rest of the people were not quite sure about these advantages and needed to have them explained.

There were, to be sure, a few dissentients of the chronic kicker type, who did not like the idea of having land expensive even though property values in the nation were thus increased by billions of dollars, and whom no one seemed able to convince. These dissentients objected that it was now harder for most people to buy homes than it had been, and harder for cities to buy land for playgrounds for the children and for parks, that mortgages were necessary to enable any but the well-to-do to buy land for homes or farms or business, that crowding in the slums was getting worse and that the speculative holding of land out of use was interfering with industry and production and raising the cost of living. What most of the kickers appeared to desire was that the community-produced rental value of land should be the first and principal source of public revenue. It is to be feared that they had been infected with the virus of Single Tax.

But such critics failed to realize the importance of high land values as a foundation of prosperity. Lacking the vision and the breadth of view of the substantial landowning class, they were unable to see beyond the immediate apparent pecuniary interest.

As a matter of fact, it was not alone the owners of land who benefited by the new policy. For it should not be forgotten that from their large and increasing rents the landlord rich were able to employ many a butlers, gardeners, caddies, nurse maids, kitchen maids, interior decorators and companions, and to buy jewelry and steam yachts and silks and satins and expensive liquors. Even, therefore, if more did have to be paid by working people for permission to work and to live on the land, this money was spent by the landlords in demands for the services of the poor. So the poor, by enriching the landlords, indirectly enriched themselves.

Although some of the poorer and less educated people could not understand this, it was quite clear to those who were intellectually acute and who could reason out how a person becomes richer by having to pay more to others and by keeping less for himself, because then these others have more with which to demand his goods and services.

Of course it would not have made the landowners richer to tax their rents and give the proceeds to the poor, even though the poor could therewith buy more; but all of the landowners and, indeed, a good many of the poorer people, were able to see how it enriched the poor to pay more of the taxes and more rent to the owners of land. Some of the landowners sacrificed considerable leisure time which they might have enjoyed in playing golf or watching horse races or dog shows or examining and purchasing antiques or travelling in Europe or vacationing in Florida or Hawaii, in order to explain this important economic phenomenon to those of the common people who could not be made to understand it.

There were, to be sure, a few of the common people who were too ignorant to get a clear understanding of the matter even with all this explaining. Strange as it may seem, some of these began to burglarize the stores and engage in hold-ups and pick the pockets of copper and steel and coal and oil and gas magnates and of other great landowners. When apprehended they would say that they were merely trying to increase the prosperity of those they appeared to be robbing, that the money they thus secured was spent in buying goods from the very stores they had burglarized and from the very magnates whose pockets they had picked and that so business was stimulated and everybody's prosperity was enhanced.

It was, in truth, most unfortunate that, despite the sacrificial efforts of the owners of natural resources and of valuable city sites to make the recipe of prosperity clear to the common people, such mistaken notions as this should gain currency. Obviously, the incidental disreputable and illegitimate and violent thievery did nothing to raise the value of land and could not, therefore, increase prosperity. Stern repressive measures had to be adopted, and the owners of land and natural resources had to sacrifice even more of their time and money to make the recipe of prosperity understood by the masses generally. But, gradually, even the most ignorant began to see the light, thereby justifying that abiding faith in the intelligence of the common people and in American institutions and in high land values, so eloquently and often professed by the leaders of our great party.

It ought to be noted at this point it was not just indirectly and through the general stimulus to business from high rents and land values that the common people hoped to gain from tax relief for land. A number of the poorer citizens reasonably expected to profit directly from an increase in the value of remote and swampy building lots which they had been able to buy on the installment plan.

\* \* \*

When the farmers and home owners and owners of business sites and the real estate boards and land speculators and teachers, and the people generally, saw what

prosperity was being brought about by the simple expedient of relieving land of taxation, when they realized how the leaving of nearly all of the community-produced rental value of land in the hands of private owners had raised the value of all the land in the country and, by encouraging speculative holding of vacant land, had still further raised this value; they began to wonder if they could not devise other policies to raise the value of land and to promote the prosperity of the nation still more.

It was quickly seen that any further measures, to be effective, must be national in scope, and all the people began to look hopefully to their newly elected President for leadership in this great adventure. The President, who had pledged himself to work in the interests of the forgotten man, saw clearly that this forgotten man was typically the landowner, whose land was worth too little even yet, despite the spread of the tax relief policy among the states, and he did not disappoint an expectant nation. After a careful and statesmanlike consideration of all the important facts, an administration bill was introduced into Congress, which provided that new and additional taxes, to be known as processing taxes, should be levied on various productive processes and that the proceeds should be turned over to agricultural landowners, the rich and prosperous as well as those heavily mortgaged, whose land was being used for production, on condition that they should at once withdraw a large fraction of this land from use. The administration should have the right, if circumstances seemed to warrant, to increase this fraction. Congress passed the new legislation with enthusiasm and alacrity and the new policy was put into effect at once.

The good results were almost immediately manifest. Owners of farms and plantations on which there had been numerous tenants and farm laborers, made haste to terminate their contracts with a large number of their tenants and discharged many of their laborers, their hearts overflowing with gratitude for the wise leadership and statesmanship of the President, who had not failed to remember the long forgotten men to whom God, in his infinite wisdom, had entrusted the land and natural resources of the country. In truth, the day of these forgotten men seemed to have dawned at last and the glory of the rising sun of their prosperity illumined all their thoughts and anticipations.

For the policy of paying owners of land to remove it from use, reduced the amount of land available for farm tenants and farm laborers to work on, and caused them to bid more desperately for the chance to work on the land still left in use, and so enabled owners to charge higher rents and to pay lower wages, and so raised the value of their land. This, of course, made the nation more prosperous, and, therefore, in the end, made wages higher.

A few unthinking critics said it would be better to tax

the rent yielded by the superior land and to pay some of the farm tenants and farm laborers not to work and thus to make farm labor scarce and raise the wages of farm workers, rather than to tax workers in their food and clothing purchases to pay landowners to withdraw their land. Other critics said that if the owners of farm lands were to receive benefit payments from the government, only the more needy ones should receive the payments and the money required should be raised by a tax on the billions of dollars of community-produced value of city land instead of on the necessities of the poor. But what all these critics persistently overlooked was the basic principle underlying the new policy, viz., that high land values are the foundation of prosperity. To pay laborers for not working would most certainly lower land values rather than raise them, and to tax city land might lower its value by even more than the benefits to agricultural landowners raised the value of agricultural land.

But it was important to restore a proper balance between industry and agriculture. New Deal statesmen said they intended to put agriculture on a par with industry. There was much discussion as to what this meant. Many city workers had been out of jobs and, at times, cold and hungry. There had been jobs about as usual in the country. Narrow-minded critics said the President and Congress must be trying to bring about an equal unemployment among cotton croppers and other farm tenants and farm laborers, so that these would be cold and hungry too, in order that agriculture and industry might be on a par with each other. But such critics had no vision whatever of how all the people could be benefitted by making land scarce and raising its value and did not sympathize with the President's policy of aiding the forgotten man.

An unidentified old man—possibly the last living Single Taxer—was heard to remark about this time, in a street crowd down in Mobile, that it must have been the cotton croppers and other farm tenants and laborers of Scottish extraction that the poet, Robert Burns, had in mind when he wrote of "Scots, wha hae wi' Wallace bled." But what idea the old man meant to convey by his remark, no one seemed to know, and he slipped away before anyone had a chance to ask.

It was feared, however, that a considerable number of landowners might be tempted by the high prices of products, induced by the scarcity of them, to use all their land rather than to withdraw part of it from production. To make certain that none would follow a policy so disruptive of the entire New Deal programme, Senator X. sponsored a supplementary act putting a prohibitive tax on the excess output of plantation owners who failed to withdraw a sufficient proportion of their previously productive land from use. This new act effectively prevented too many people from having jobs raising cotton or baling or ginning it or transporting it. But it was most unfortunate that so much of the valuable

time of Senators had to be spent planning how to make people withdraw land from use. It would have been much better if there had been less good land in the country to begin with, if, for example, the Sahara desert had been located in the South of the United States instead of in Africa.

Because of some complaints that a large number of former tenants were no longer needed on the land and that they were being kicked off to find such living as they could on the relief rolls, Senator N. introduced a bill providing that the government should establish a Farm Home Corporation through which farm tenants and farm laborers who desired to buy farms might be enabled to pay for them in installments. The bonds of the corporation were to be guaranteed by the government. This pleased almost everybody in the Senator's state. A few of the tenants and laborers thought they might possibly be able to buy a little land and, even, eventually pay for it, despite the rising price of land resulting from New Deal policy, if they could pay off their mortgages by easy stages. Even if they were unable to produce enough on the land to pay off these mortgages, at any rate they might be able to live on it several months during which no owner could dispossess them. And, of course, all of the landowners saw clearly that, if such a Farm Home Corporation increased the demand for and the price of land, they could get even more for such land as they might want to sell than the other legislation just by itself would enable them to get. It was obviously proper and desirable to pass laws that would raise the value of land, but to tax land values rather than other things, in order to make land cheap for tenants and laborers to buy, would have been obviously improper as well as inconsistent with much of New Deal policy.

\* \* \*

But the policy of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use was not fully effective, since it applied only to agricultural land. The owners of city land and mines and power sites and oil and gas wells insisted that some of their land should be withdrawn, too, with adequate compensation for withdrawing it. So the President shortly began to consider to what kinds of land and how far his policy should be extended.

Realizing the importance of technically trained expert advice, the President had already put several of the better known young economists of quasi-socialistic sympathies into important official positions and he consulted them frequently. The most distinguished of these, Dr. Z., following somewhat the line of argument of Karl Marx and various other socialists, emphasized the fact that production had become too efficient. Labor-saving machinery and efficiency engineers had been developing rapidly. It should have been possible to see, a generation ago, he said, that the world could be overwhelmed with goods. If, therefore, there was unemployment and a difficulty of finding jobs for the unemployed, this



was not at all due to the speculation in land which had come from the low taxes on land, nor yet was it due to the prosperity-building policy of the President and of the Secretary of Agriculture, of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use. In short, it was neither the speculative holding out of use of land in anticipation of a rise of land prices, nor the formal withdrawal of land from production for the sake of benefit payments, that was decreasing the employment opportunities of wage earners, but what was decreasing these opportunities was the efficient production of goods.

So the policy of restricting output by withdrawing land from use was consistent with the best conclusions of economic analysis and research. Consequently, further steps in the same direction, such as paying city landowners to hold more sites out of use, and owners of oil and coal land and iron and copper mines to hold more of these resources out of use, should be helpful in making the nation even more prosperous through bringing about more competition to use land and making land values still higher, and reducing not only the wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco which could be produced, but also the automobiles, radios, structural steel, oil, coal, shoes, shirts and other goods.

Perhaps, indeed, the national prosperity would be even more effectively promoted and more men given employment, if nearly all of the land could be withdrawn from use and the output of goods reduced by several hundred per cent. But the number of books on economics and sociology, especially those written by socialistically-minded young professors who had become administrators and advisors, should be increased rather than decreased, in order that the common people might learn how desirable it was to withdraw land from use, stimulate a healthy competition among tenants to use land, prevent an excess of goods, and thereby promote the general prosperity.

New legislation was quickly formulated and passed, applying the brilliant New Deal policy to land which had been used for all kinds of production and not merely to agricultural land. Not only did this prevent too great an output of goods to all other sorts, as well as of food and raw materials, and raise all prices, but, by inducing the withdrawal of more land from use than had previously been withdrawn, it concentrated the demand for laborers and tenants and enterprise upon the remaining land and greatly raised the rent and, therefore, the sale value of land. This, of course, made the nation richer than ever and raised wages and increased employment.

*(To be Continued.)*

TO see land is to discover it, and according to the childish laws of men to discover it is to own it. Ownership gives the right to gather its riches, and to that end kill all who stand in the way, whether they be Indians or white men claiming they saw it first.

"The Tale of Chicago," by EDGAR LEE MASTERS.

## Fortieth Anniversary at Arden

THE regular annual celebration of the birth of Henry George and the Fortieth Anniversary of the Delaware Single Tax Campaign was held in the Field Theatre, Sunday, Sept. 1, under favorable conditions, with a very good attendance.

Henry W. Hetzel presided and gave an appropriate biographical sketch of the life and work of Henry George and a synopsis of the history of the work in Delaware in 1895 and 1896. Mr. Hetzel said that Henry George was a brilliant example of the self-made man and that the Single Tax had, in addition to being an appealing fiscal proposal, certain spiritual qualities not apparent in the name. That the only difference between burglary and landlordism is that the latter is legalized. That Mr. Hoover has said that "to abolish poverty we must increase production," but to do this would only increase the value of land and further enrich landlords. The publicity of the Delaware Campaign was highly beneficial to the general Single Tax movement.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille followed Mr. Hetzel and paid tribute to the devotion and golden eloquence of Frank Stephens, one of Arden's founders. Mrs. de Mille reported a very great increase in the interest of people everywhere in our movement. She spoke particularly about the Henry George School of Social Science, paying a well-deserved tribute to Oscar Geiger, its founder, and urging a class in Arden.

Grace Isabel Colbron quoted Henry George's, "Unless its foundations be laid in justice, the social structure cannot stand." She said that our present world situation was proof that the foundations of society were not sound. That there was poverty even when men were fully employed. That labor was poor long before the present depression. That we treat symptoms, not causes. In answer to those who complain that Single Taxers do not go far enough, she said that when men go either to the north or south pole they usually return and tell about it as they can go no farther. Strictly speaking, the only property is what people individually create by their own efforts; that the value of land is a communal product and therefore not property in the true sense. Miss Colbron also paid a fine tribute to the memory of Frank Stephens.

Henry George, 3rd, made a very forceful and convincing statement concerning the basis of the large fortunes of the Astors, the Carnegies and the Rockefellers, which were all derived from law-made privilege. That such natural inequalities in men did not exist but only seemed to be so because of these privileges and the ability to stifle competition. He quoted Thomas Jefferson as saying that crime in this country followed the monopolization of land.

Edwin Ross, Jr., dwelt on the question of compensating landlords. As the Single Tax did not propose to take away title to land, there was nothing for which to compensate; and that if anyone was to be compensated it should be those who have been impoverished by an unjust and stupid system of taxation.

An open forum for questions and answers with an interesting discussion followed the regular meeting.—E. S. Ross.

## A Violation of the Creative Spirit

MUSSOLINI not only apes the Imperial Schoolmarm abroad, he apes her senile idiocies at home. In order to diminish as far as possible unemployment among Italian laborers the Inter-Syndical Committee has decided that "no mechanical means whatsoever shall be used for the next harvest." Demented as such a proceeding self-evidently is, it is a perfect reflection of the conduct of our municipalities, which insist on the greatest possible amount of hard labor under their contracts. There can be little risk of peace as long as war is the saner. Production is an aspect of Creation, and the failure to utilize every advance towards supreme efficiency is a violation of the Creative Spirit.—*New English Weekly*.

# Tenth Henry George Congress

HOTEL NEW YORKER, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 26, 27 AND 28

THE Henry George Congress has met and adjourned. The friendships formed after three days' intimate contact are certain to be renewed by correspondence and future meetings. We have shaken hands across the sea in a very real sense. Arthur Madsen of London and F. Folke of Copenhagen, have cemented a friendship between our workers here and the devoted group of adherents to the Georgist philosophy in the countries from which they come. We have been apprised of what they are doing in England and Denmark, of which many have learned for the first time, and this knowledge is a revelation as well as an inspiration to renewed effort here.

It is time to appraise the value of the Congress itself. It will be remembered that we had certain criticisms to make of the Chicago gathering a year ago. The New York gathering of this year is a distinct improvement.

There are still some criticisms to be made. There is still possible great improvement in these gatherings. There are still defects to be corrected. We were spared a few of the definite disagreements with Henry George with which we have been regaled on previous occasions, disagreements which have no place in such conferences met to renew our faith in the teachings of the master. We do not question the sincerity of the gentlemen who put different interpretations on these teachings, but we must demand that they seek other forums. Their opposition at Henry George Congresses is an illicit intrusion. The Henry George Congress is not a debating society, but a meeting to advance certain definite principles and consider definite lines of action.

Did the Congress succeed in doing this? We think it did. Indeed the activities of the Henry George School of Social Science, opening up a new and tremendously promising sphere of opportunity for advance, impressed all present. Perhaps the only ones who showed impatience with the slow advance were the young student graduates of the School who want to see something done *at once*. Privilege may look to itself in the face of the growing anxiety of the new youthful adherents to the Georgist philosophy to realize the teachings of the master in actual accomplishment. The suggestion of Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett that bills be introduced in every State Legislature of the forty-eight States appealed to them and will find response everywhere. We are more confident that ever of the early realization of our hopes.

Another very hopeful sign at this gathering was the emphasis laid by nearly all the speakers on the individualistic character of our philosophy and the repudiation of Socialism and social planning which includes so much that is definitely antagonistic to our philosophy. There was a consciousness that the Roosevelt policies were

doomed, and that our appeal is to the producers of the world, to capital and business men, for the relief of industry and the preservation of the rights of property. In other words, there was a prevailing tendency to present our doctrines as the sole hope for successful opposition to the confusions of the New Deal and to place in the hands of business leaders, and of labor and capital, the real remedy for poverty and depressions.

We thank the press of the city for the very generous space allowed to the proceedings of the Congress. We differ with our friends who believe that there is a conspiracy of silence among newspapers with regard to our movement. Newspapers will give the news if we provide it for them. The newspapers are still newspapers, not entirely governed by their editorial policy nor by their advertisers. Their advertisers, too, are business men and very much interested at this time in matters of taxation. What interests them will interest the newspapers. As we make news (and in the exact proportion that we make it) the daily press will give us space. We need not be concerned about that.

As to the Congress itself it is necessary to speak. Too much praise cannot be given to the chairman of the Congress, Edward P. Donovan, who presided with skill and dignity.

The "high lights" may be briefly indicated. They include the admirable address of Col. Rule, the report of the Extension Classes of the Henry George School of Social Science from the Field Director of the School, John Lawrence Monroe, the speech of young Bill Trueheart, a fourteen year old boy from Houston, Texas, who knows his economics and is able to express them forcibly and well; the eloquent speech of Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn and the touching tribute to him from his comrade in arms in the Argonne, Hon. Abe D. Waldauer. The appealing figure of the blind rabbi whose words thrilled those present will remain with us for a long time, and the beautiful tribute of his friend will echo in our ears after many incidents of the gathering are forgotten.

Mention must not be omitted of the address of Arthur Madsen, the editor of *Land and Liberty* of London, beloved friend of John Paul, and the interesting account from F. Folke of the real progress made in Denmark. Both Mr. Folke and Mr. Madsen have a keen sense of humor, and let us not be told again that our English friends lack humor. In this sense of humor our Danish representative is not far behind. We should include also in the mention of what we have termed the "high lights" of the Congress the well chosen words of Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, chairman of the Friday night session, and the searching inquiry into our principles and purposes

made by Benjamin W. Burger in his paper, "What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George," which we hope to publish some time.

At the banquet Mayor McNair of Pittsburgh regaled us again with his purely American humor. He knew his audience when he said, "Is there anybody here who doesn't want to make a speech," and a good natured laugh went up.

The banquet was a big success. An attendance of over two hundred, each of whom paid \$2.50 for an excellent dinner, was larger than that of any previous Congress. And as if loth to depart the members of the conference stayed after midnight to exchange greetings and farewells. Thus came to an end a memorable, and on the whole a really constructive Henry George Congress.

## Opening Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY MRS. ADELIN T. MUHLENBERG

THE opening session of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress began Sept. 26, 1935, at 10 a. m. with Edmund P. Donovan of New York City, chairman of the New York Convention Committee, and Charles Joseph Smith of New York as the chairman of the session. The subject for this session was "The Henry George School of Social Science."

Mr. Donovan gave an address of welcome and introduced Charles Joseph Smith.

Mr. Donovan again resumed the chair and asked that "brevity" be the keynote of the convention. He then introduced the chairman of the session and Mr. Smith took the chair. Mr. Smith said, "the finest method of learning is by way of teaching." He urged that we "keep the sun of our cause rising."

The principal speaker was Otto K. Dorn of New York, Business Manager of the Henry George School of Social Science, who reported on the activities of the School. He called the School "a clearing house for all schools." Mr. Dorn anticipates a larger registration than ever before. The Teacher's Training Classes are becoming more popular.

There followed five minute reports from teachers and alumni students of the School at its National Headquarters as follows:

Roma B. Halpern, graduate of Teachers' Training Course advises that all problems and questions on the work be brought to the class for discussion. The methods of this class were given in detail.

Charles Erwood, present member of the Training Class, left the thought that "most people who study Henry George think they know it better than anyone else."

Stephen Bell, foreign editor of *Commerce and Finance*, spoke on the importance of "free trade" in and out of the movement. He gave a very instructive talk on the tariff, saying "too much attention cannot be given to free trade; it can give all nations and all mankind a place in the sun." Mr. Bell urged a special class at the School on tariffs.

Lancaster Green of New York pleaded for a restimulation of the movement by all. Mrs. H. H. McEvoy of Alaska and Chicago told of her work in Chicago among the colored women.

Morris Van Veen pleaded for imparting the Henry George theory every day of one's life. Mr. A. C. Thompson of Toronto Canada, told of spending an entire lesson on the Malthusian theory with all of his classes.

Mr. Herbert M. Garn of New York addressed the convention. Mr. Smith completed the session. Mr. Donovan then presented to the convention the following distinguished guests who were present:

Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala., Miss Charlotte Schetter of New York, Bill Beach Truehart and Mrs. William Truehart of Houston, Texas, the Messers. Ellert from Milk River, Alberta, Canada, Mr. F. Folke of Denmark and Mr. Arthur Madsen of England.

## Second Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY MRS. ADELIN T. MULHENBERG

THE second session of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress convened at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City, on Thursday, Sept. 26, 1935 at 2 p. m. with James F. Oastler of New York as chairman. The subject of this session was "Extension Classes of the Henry George School of Social Science." Mr. John Lawrence Monroe of Chicago, Field Director of the Henry George School of Social Science, was the principal speaker.

Edmund P. Donovan, chairman of the Congress opened the session with announcements of the exhibitions in New York City of first editions and galley sheets of "Progress and Poverty" and other writings of Henry George at the New York Public Library, and the portrait of Henry George as painted by an American artist, George de Forrest, and donated to the Metropolitan Museum by August Lewis who commissioned the portrait.

Mr. Donovan introduced Mr. Oastler who, after his greetings and expediting of the subject in turn presented John Lawrence Monroe. Mr. Monroe told of his visits to different parts of the country and Canada, and reported the extent and progress of the movement. "There are too few people who know," said Mr. Monroe. He urged the use of radio, class work and the press, to arouse the interest of the country. An outline of the methods of teaching was given and systems of attracting students presented. "Realize," said Mr. Monroe, "the power of education to spread this teaching."

Mr. Oastler then presented a number of speakers from various parts of the country to give five minute reports on Extension Classes as follows:

Rabbi Michael Aaronsohn of Cincinnati, reported the progress of classes by personal contacts, the radio, and the press. "Acquaint the world with Henry George's teachings," was the message that he left with us.

Dave Margolis of Cleveland, O., spoke.

Richard E. Howe of Pittsburgh, reported on the class movement in that city.

Robert C. Bowers contrasted the success of the present as compared with the past in Pittsburgh.

Bill Beach Truehart of Houston, Texas, representing a splendid example of the youth of today and the interest that can be created in and among the younger generation, interested this session immensely. Mrs. William Truehart, mother of this youth, and the instructor of a class of high school boys in Houston on the teachings of Henry George followed. Eva L. Maxwell of New York and Danbury, responsible for the organization of class work in Connecticut, spoke hopefully of our progress.

Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen of Newark, N. J., left some very constructive messages on teaching by the use of the blackboard; in assisting the reading by summary work; by giving a thorough understanding of the "seven terms."

J. B. Ellert, Milk River, Alberta, Canada, spoke of his success in giving the Henry George philosophy to others by the spoken word. He drew his examples from Milk River, his home town, the town of the Single Tax. Miss Sarah Dupont of Cambridge, Mass., spoke. W. W. Monroe, of Schenectady, a Henry George follower for fifty years, said he is prepared to teach four classes every week.

Hartley Dennett, East Alstead, N. H., was now heard, and Mrs. Anna George de Mille, daughter of Henry George who reported the results of the progress of her efforts in California during the summer, F. Folke of Denmark, who has helped to spread the Henry George

theory in Denmark, gave us the thought "one cannot teach the principles of Henry George without thoroughly understanding them."

Mr. Arthur Madsen of England related the progress made in his country. He suggested the publication of a summary of "Progress and Poverty" so that it might be placed in the hands of prospects as well as students.

Dr. Bowen announced that she had in her possession an original newspaper, *The New York World*, wherein many years ago Henry George himself had published a complete summary of "Progress and Poverty." Mr. Edmund P. Donovan then closed the meeting with the announcement of the evening session.

## Evening Session, Sept. 26

REPORTED BY CHAS. ERWOOD

MR. LANCASTER GREEN, as chairman opened the meeting and introduced Mrs. Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala. Mrs. Johnson began her address by urging that Georgists and Socialists should come together in their fight for social equality. She expressed the belief that the Socialists would see that the socialization of land value would accomplish the aim of social justice without having recourse to the rest of the Socialist programme; that they would be content with this fundamental step and not try to socialize capital as well.

Most interesting was her theory that children are brought up to expect injustice, and she went on to explain that external standards set up by schools and parents foreordained many to failure. She criticized the school system as closing the mind to truth; learning to accept truth on authority instead of accepting truth for authority. Schooling must meet the need of the individual instead of forcing the individual into a fixed pattern.

Mrs. Johnson laid our present difficulty to lack of purchasing power and strongly advocated the Townsend Plan as a remedy, but stipulated that the pension must be paid by collecting economic rent.

Mr. Waldauer of Memphis, Tenn., opened his address with the now celebrated story of his first Single Tax speech at the age of thirteen.

He then spoke feelingly of his meeting with Rabbi Aaronsohn in France in the Argonne and of the comradeship known to men who have faced death together, and said, "Great as was that comradeship, it cannot compare with the comradeship known to the followers of Henry George."

Mr. Waldauer told of the fight to stop sales tax legislation in the State of Tennessee, and drew comparisons between Tennesseans' and New Yorkers' reactions to sales tax legislation that was not at all complimentary to New Yorkers. He quoted from a letter of Enoch Emsley who, long before George, had written, "Never tax anything that would be of value to you or your State, that could or would run away, or that could or would come to you."

In closing Mr. Waldauer said that despite the general illiteracy in Tennessee there was more tax literacy than in many sections of the country, and that he hoped to see sales taxes and all other forms of taxation on production abolished in the near future.

Rabbi Aaronsohn referred to this as his maiden speech at a Henry George Congress and hoped that it would be the first of many.

The Rabbi went on to say that most conventions are called to benefit some partisan interests, to gain privilege for some group or individuals; but that this convention was called for an unselfish cause and a noble purpose.

The chief object of this gathering should be to choose the best way of spreading the philosophy of Henry George, and the only way to fill the empty press section would be to knit the followers of Henry George into a close compact army. "We cannot look upon ourselves merely as disciples of a great teacher, but must also be warriors, girt for battle, ready to fight a series of orderly engagements instead of the present guerrilla warfare against injustice and corruption."

He was enthusiastic about the work of the Henry George Fellowship and the Henry George School and said that the Fellowship should be the mother institute of the Georgist movement, the heart and the guiding mind.

Rabbi Aaronsohn paid tribute to the work of Tom L. Johnson, Louis F. Post, and Oscar H. Geiger, all of whom he regarded as heroes of the Georgist movement.

## Morning Session, Sept. 27

MR. DONOVAN introduced Mrs. Mary Ware Dennett as chairman of this session which was devoted to legislative methods. Mrs. Dennett introduced James G. Blauvelt, who ran for United States Senator on the Republican ticket in New Jersey, and who is president of the Henry George League of that State. He congratulated the Congress on the progress of the Georgist cause. He paid a deserved tribute to Graham Peace for his work, "The Great Robbery."

Mrs. Dennett now called upon P. R. Williams, secretary of the Henry George Foundation, who responded briefly. Walter Fairchild spoke for the Society for Scientific Taxation, and told of the bills recommended by the society to the legislature, which now rest in committee.

Mrs. Dennett advocated the introduction of Single Tax bills in every State, such bills to conform to circumstances. A greater stimulation would thus be afforded, giving an opportunity to those who wanted to do something for the cause.

Joseph Dana Miller reported for California by reading portions of a letter from Hon. Jackson H. Ralston and submitting the following telegram:

State Federation of Labor at San Diego with five hundred delegates today unanimously endorsed again the constitutional amendment and instructed its executive board to further its adoption at the polls in November, next year.—JACKSON H. RALSTON.

Other speakers were Congressman Moritz, Donald Marcellus, Harold Sudell, the latter reading a bill, which he had prepared, for Philadelphia.

Mr. Ewing and Mr. Leubuscher also spoke.

## Afternoon Session, Sept. 27

THIS session was called to order by Mr. Bowers of Pittsburgh, who announced that the principal speaker Mr. Schwartz was unable to be present. The same announcement was made respecting Henry George Atkinson.

Miss Antoinette Kaufmann reviewed the work of the Schalkenbach Foundation, and the history of the movement since 1897, and answered a number of questions.

Mrs. Gertrude E. Mackenzie spoke for the Women's Washington Single Tax organization.

Mrs. Eva Maxwell reported for the *Forum and No Taxes* of Stockton, Calif., and Mr. Miller reported for LAND AND FREEDOM.

Mr. Edward Polak detailed his efforts, which were remarkably successful, in the High School Essay contests and the Forum which he established some years ago. He advocated a policy of "boring from within" through the dominant parties. In 1922 we did this and were successful in establishing a ten year exemption, of improvements from taxation, which gave a great impetus to building.

Alfred M. Chandler reported for activities in New Jersey and the bill which received 22 votes, lacking only nine of adoption.

Mrs. Bessie Beach Truehart of Houston, Texas, stressed the necessity of appealing to the masses.

The speakers also included George Lloyd, Chas. Johnson Post, Mrs. McAvoy, Mrs. DuBois and others.

## International Night, Sept. 27

REPORTED BY DONALD MARCELLUS

**T**HIS session was presided over by Hon. Charles O'Connor Hennessy.

An address on "Land Value Taxation in Politics and in Practise in Denmark," was delivered by Mr. Folke.

Mr. Folke described the long battle and slow evolution of Georgian principles in Denmark. The outstanding events were: abolition of serfdom in 1788, the adoption of a democratic constitution in 1849, the growth of cooperatives which gave the small farmers power against the landed proprietors, the famous scientific land valuation carried out between 1805 and 1826, the bringing of Georgian teachings to Denmark by Jacob Lange in 1884, assessments at one hundred per cent of market value in 1903, separate assessment of land and buildings in 1916 and the financing and land settlement acts of 1899 and 1919. Under the financing provisions of these acts about ten per cent of Danish farms came into existence. In 1932 tax exemption of all farm improvements and part of city improvements was achieved, also a tax on land value increases which had the interesting effect of inducing landholders to make a true declaration of the value of their holdings. Also at this time the Georgists succeeded in getting subsidies for farmers in place of tax reductions.

The importance of the Danish achievements can be partially judged by realizing that up until 1930 Denmark had more commerce than any other nation in relation to the size of its population, and that practically all Danish farmers owned their own farms as contrasted with our ever growing proportion of tenant farmers. They have far to go yet as is made apparent by the fact that they only take 1.4 per cent of the total taxable land value but their legislation is progressively building up to achieve pure Single Tax.

The grain-dumping activities of America forced England to give up her agriculture and forced Germany to take refuge behind tariffs but Denmark built up a new agricultural industry. The Danish farmers also proved that small farms were as efficient producers as large ones. (This will be of particular interest to the advocates of the large scale plans of the Technocrats.)

Mr. Folke's description of the defensive tactics of the Georgists was particularly interesting. Attempts to substitute *income taxes* for land taxes were parried by showing that this *would favor the rich* (they would pay lower taxes on their incomes than they had to pay on their speculative lands) *those that received the most services from the community and those that improved their farms the least*. When in the agriculture crisis of 1930, attempts were made to reduce land taxes, it was pointed out by the Georgists that the debt burden was more oppressive than the tax burden and that the debt burden would increase if taxes were reduced.

Other speakers at this session were Arthur Madsen of London, Alan Thompson of Toronto and Col. Victor A. Rule of Chicago.

## Morning Session, Sept. 28

REPORTED BY MRS. EVA L. MAXWELL

**I**N the absence of Mr. Jesse M. Zeeman, Col. Victor A. Rule presided.

Mr. Benjamin W. Burger, the speaker of the session, took for his subject, "What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George."

He said our philosophy can find acceptance only in the well-ordered mind, those who sense a divine order in the universe, for we see things not as *they* are but as *we* are. Therefore to understand the Georgist philosophy requires for the ordinary mind the establishment of a new viewpoint. He must understand the fundamentals of political economy. Mr. Burger then listed six qualities which distinguish land from private property, as follows:

1. The earth is not produced by man, but is the gift of the Creator, for the equal use of all.
2. It is limited in quantity.
3. It is essential to existence.
4. It does not owe its value to anything that landowners choose to put upon it.
5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.
6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

As in law, there are five points to establish the necessity for the collection of ground rent. The First is that man in his physical aspect is a land animal.

As Georgists we are radical. We place the emphasis on land as the essential, while the Socialist places it on the non-essential, capital. The Second point we must establish is that all human beings have an equal right to live on the earth. The Third point, that the earth cannot be privately owned follows from the first two. The Fourth point is that land rent measures the desirability of different locations. And, Fifth, the most difficult to establish to the satisfaction of beginners is, that by using ground rent for our common needs, we secure for each and every human being the equal right to live.

It is of vital importance if we would be understood, that the terms of political economy, land, labor, capital, rent, wages and interest mean exactly the same to our hearers as they mean to us.

Mr. Roy A. Folke, of Dun and Bradstreet, discussed the effects of land speculation on business enterprises. He established the fact that speculative increase in land value causes an undue proportion of income to go to rent. The economic function of business is to produce goods and services. Too large an investment in land leads to bankruptcy.

Discussion followed from the floor. Mrs. Marietta Johnson of Fairhope, Ala., urged that we bring our gospel to church people. She said that love was impossible if we allow individuals to take what they do not produce, or if society takes from individuals what they produce. There was further discussion by Professor Oppenheimer, author of "The State," Miss Charlotte Schetter, Messrs. Leubuscher, Fiske Warren, Foley, Tynes, Odgen, Marcellus, Olcott and others. They further emphasized that we must put this fundamental teaching in language the people can understand.

## Meeting Board of Directors of Henry George Foundation

**C**LAYTON J. EWING presided and Edward P. Donovan thanked the officers of the Foundation for the fine cooperation established between the official body and the committee of arrangements of which he was chairman. He suggested the formation of a more militant organization and spoke of the work being done in Great Britain of which Mr. Madsen had told us.

The officials of the Foundation were re-elected at this meeting and Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, on motion of Mr. Leubuscher, was elected to the Board and Miss C. H. Fuller was elected on motion of Mr. Miller.

Mr. P. R. Williams reported for the Foundation.

Mr. Waldauer advocated enclaves for land reverting to the States where anybody could go to the land on a ninety-nine year lease.

On motion of Mrs. de Mille the thanks of the board was given to the efficient chairman of the Congress, Edward P. Donovan.

Resolutions having been ruled out of convention proceedings the following resolution suggested by Mr. Ewing had been drawn up and introduced at this meeting by Mr. Miller.

Believing that the principal cause of wars is the hunger for land and the policy of greedy nations in the grabbing of territory, and

Believing also that the imposition of tariffs that strangle trade divide peoples into hostile camps, thus accentuating the temptation to conflict, we call attention to the need of considering the teachings

of Henry George who pointed out a way for the destruction of these peace-destroying institutions, the freeing of Industry from tariff barriers, and the establishment of the natural rights of man to the lands of nations, thus bringing about a reign of universal peace.

## Visit to the Grave of Henry George

REPORTED BY M. VAN VEEN

ON Saturday, Sept. 28, about one hundred members of the Henry George Congress availed themselves of the opportunity of paying tribute at the grave of our great leader Henry George in his resting place in Greenwood cemetery.

Most of those present went, owing to the thoughtfulness of the Committee, in a huge stage, while others went by the subway.

A most beautiful and fitting tribute was made by Col. Victor A. Rule, in the absence of Hon. Peter Witt who was to have made the memorial address. Called upon at short notice thanks are due to Col. Rule for his beautiful and feeling tribute to our great leader.

This was followed by an address by F. Folke, of Denmark, who explained that the heather flowers which he laid upon the grave were gathered by his fellow countrymen to be so placed.

Mr. Madsen followed with an eloquent address, and in behalf of the English followers presented a beautiful wreath which was placed at the foot of the monolith. Mr. Madsen said: "He is alive with the spirit of those who are alive with his thought."

All agreed that they had been present at a beautiful ceremony that they would cherish as an imperishable memory.

## Banquet Henry George Congress

REPORTED BY MRS. MARGARET F. BINGHAM

THE Tenth Annual Henry George Congress came to an impressive close on Sept. 28, when over two hundred people gathered at a banquet in the ballroom of the Hotel New Yorker.

Mr. Edmund P. Donovan, to whose intelligent and capable direction much of the success of the Congress was due, acted as toastmaster. Mr. Donovan, an Englishman, modestly yet humorously referred to his selection as Chairman of the New York Convention Committee. Mr. Leonard T. Recker had notified him of his appointment. Said Mr. Donovan, "I was a stranger in a strange land, and Mr. Recker took me in—and how."

First to be introduced was Mr. Percy R. Williams, secretary of the Henry George Foundation, and Chief Assessor of Pittsburgh. Mr. Williams reminded the gathering that conventions are merely a means to an end, and expressed the conviction that all had profited by this one. Reporting on conditions in Pittsburgh, he gave the satisfying information that the Mayor, the Administration, and a majority of the Board of Assessors, are Single Taxers.

Mr. Helmuth Moller, First Vice Consul of the Kingdom of Denmark, son of a prominent Danish Georgist, introduced the next speaker, Mr. F. Folke of Denmark, President of the Henry George Society of Denmark. Mr. Folke brought resolutions of greeting from that body. He spoke of the difference between America and Denmark. America is young, strong, with conditions of life new and different from those of Europe. The Danes, on the other hand, occupy an old, small country, hemmed in by the sea. They can hope for nothing by strength; their only hope is through justice. Theirs is a happy country, however, for every child is true heir to his fatherland, as Henry George advocated. Although Denmark, too, has unemployment, quotas, and restrictions, freedom and equality permeate the spirit of the people. Mr. Folke gave a disarming account of his impressions of New York. Although prepared by pictures for the skyline and for skyscrapers, he was thrilled and de-

lighted by seeing them. This, he said, is what a people can do with even a little freedom and democracy, such as we have had. Now that free land is gone, democracy has lost its foundation. America must return to true democracy and the principles of Henry George. It will then be the happy country of the world.

Mr. Arthur Madsen, of London, editor of *Land and Liberty*, told of his first contact with the idea of the Single Tax, years ago, in East London, Cape Province, Africa. From 1909 he was associated with John Paul at the United Committee for Land Value Taxation. An interesting trend in Great Britain today is shown by the fact that Sheffield, England, and Cardiff, Wales, have separately called upon all cities to join in petitioning Parliament to shift taxes to land values. Mr. Madsen spoke of the misunderstanding on the part of Liberals as well as Protectionists on the meaning of "laissez-faire." It is not obsolete, as they think, nor does it mean "Let things alone." It means "LET THINGS BE DONE," and was originally said by the French Physiocrats to a government whose taxation was restricting enterprise.

The entire gathering stood for a minute of silent tribute to the Single Taxers who have passed on during the last year,—to Frank Stevens, William Black, Francis Maguire, Judge Robert Minor, and Mrs. Julia Goldzier.

The Hon. William McNair, Mayor of Pittsburgh, then spoke. He made the telling point that the people must select as law makers men really fitted for their jobs, with a knowledge of economics. Henry George schools throughout the country will provide them. From leaders produced by the schools, the masses will get the idea that community value should be taken for community purposes. When they realize what economic rent is, they will take it.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille read an inspiring letter written by her father to Father Dawson, of Dublin, in which he explained his dedication to the cause of freedom.

A fitting valedictory to the banquet, and, indeed, to the Convention itself, was uttered by Mr. Folke. All winds of Europe, he said come from the west. Many messages have been sent from the new country to the old; that of Benjamin Franklin, who tore the lightning from heaven, and the sceptre from tyranny; that of Woodrow Wilson, whose name will never be forgotten in Denmark; that of Henry George, true Democrat, and prophet of freedom and justice.

## Mr. Folke's Speech Before Grave of Henry George Greenwood Cemetery

I AM here on behalf of the Danish Henry George Union to do honor to the memory of our great leader in gratitude for what he has given to each of his followers: an active and fertile viewpoint on the central economic question in our social life, a firm belief in the future of mankind, an ideal to fight for, a service to render our country in memory of the sacrifice of our ancestors and in hope for the future of our children. The influence of Henry George was not limited to his followers. In my country his name is known and honored everywhere by the people. He was a teacher to my people—a benefactor to Denmark.

This name of honor is generally attributed to those who founded universities, who built hospitals and charitable institutions. In my country most of this work is rendered as public service. Our true benefactors are those who taught our people to understand themselves, their needs, their duties and responsibilities. These Henry George gave to many of the best of my people.

The wreath I bring has been bound by Danish friends of Henry George. It is composed of heather-flowers, the beauty of our heaths, which now are disappearing under the ploughs of our smallholders. For in Denmark such work is not accomplished by companies, but

by the individual energy of independent small farmers. They are our pioneers, and they are filled with the pioneer desire for free accessible land. They became more than any others the followers of Henry George. In 1926 their representatives received Henry George's daughter as a princess coming back to her own country. Might his message be so received all over the world by those who are seeking freedom, equality and justice.

## L' Envoi

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE—CONCLUSION AT DINNER—  
SEPT. 28.

I AM sure that those of us who have been attending the Conference feel so enthused by the reports of work being accomplished in very many directions that we are all keen to get back in the fight and are indeed "rarin' ter go."

Most of us who have been in the Henry George movement have found it difficult, at times, to keep our light burning in this darkened world, and to know that now it burns more brightly than for many a long year, is indeed encouraging.

For those great souls who blazed the trail for us to follow, who were and always must be our inspiration, our gratitude grows stronger as, with our own struggle to impress a confused humanity, we realize the courage and fortitude demanded of them. They have left us a great heritage as well as a great responsibility and the faith that was theirs in the past, gives us faith for the future—a faith to be carried high like a gleaming banner.

It is not merely our common desire to bring about an economic reform which links us so strongly that we have learned to respect our differences as to method in the accomplishment of our high purpose; it is a spiritual bond that makes for tolerance and understanding—a fraternity—a fellowship that must carry our cause to victory.

Some of you will remember the letter written by Henry George to Father Dawson of Dublin, in answer to the priest's urging him to join the Catholic Church:

"I care nothing for creeds. It seems to me that in any Church or out of them one may serve the Master. . . . And in my way in the line that duty has seemed to call me, that I have tried to do . . . . Once in daylight and in a city street, there came to me a thought, a vision, a call—give it what name you please. . . . And then and there I made a vow. Through evil and through good, whatever I have done and whatever I have left undone, to that I have been true. It was that that impelled me to write "Progress and Poverty" and that sustained me when all else failed. . . . It has never left me; it is constantly with me. . . ."

"In many different forms and in many different ways men may serve the Master. . . . Each in the station to which he has been called, let us do what is set us, and we shall not clash. From various instruments, set to different keys, comes the grand harmony."

It has not been given to many to see a vision—save as that vision comes transmuted into the golden message from one who *has* seen. But such a message has been written across our lives and most of us here have made the vow of dedication and we who have collected to be helped and to help one another—can go forth again our several ways—"each in the station to which he has been called" knowing "that from our various instruments, set to different keys, will come the Grand Harmony."

So linked as we are, tonight when we part, we do not say goodbye but rather—*au revoir, auf wiedersehen, paa gemsyn*,—and as rare Ben Johnson hath put it:

" . . . in the hope to meet  
Shortly again and make our absence sweet."

CHICAGO like Carthage was founded by cheating the natives out of their land.

EDGAR LEE MASTERS, in "Tale of Chicago."

## Address--Antoinette Kaufmann Executive Secretary of the Schalkenbach Foundation

THE following is a resumé of a talk given by Miss Antoinette Kaufmann at the Friday afternoon session, Sept. 27, of the Tenth Annual Henry George Congress at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City.

\* \* \* \*

At the time when Henry George lived, wrote, and campaigned, the force of his personality and the new truth which his message brought, combined to set in motion a great political campaign. Nationwide publicity and awareness were the inevitable results, and the Single Tax movement in 1897 reached its peak of power and popular interest.

After the tragic passing of the leader, groups and individuals carried on for many years. The Fels Fund poured resources into the hands of those who were working politically in a number of States throughout the Union, and this fund undertook a systematic printing and distribution of George's writings. The Great War saw the close of its activity. There were still faithful workers all over the country who continued individual effort, but in the long stretch from 1917 to 1925, with the exception of the work of a few men and women who maintained such organizations as the Manhattan Single Tax Club, the *Single Tax Review*, now known as LAND AND FREEDOM, etc., the movement had no definite headquarters.

Robert Schalkenbach, the head of Rankin & Co., a large printing firm in this city, and the then President of the New York Typothetae (New York Employing Printers Association,) was devoted to the principles set forth by Henry George. In November, 1924, he passed away, and it was found that he had, in his will, set up a trust fund out of his modest fortune for the purpose of spreading the ideas of Henry George through the printing of Henry George's books. This Fund was named after its founder, the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, twenty-one trustees being appointed, to serve without remuneration, as a Board of Directors. An Executive Committee of five was chosen by this board to govern the policies of the Foundation.

In 1926 it began its work. It was found at that time that the books of Henry George were practically out of print and unavailable in book shops, and many libraries in the country had worn editions left over from 1897 or from early Fels Fund donations. It was found also in this period of so-called, and comparative "prosperity," that there was that scant knowledge of Henry George and his teachings, and the general disposition of the press was to ridicule George as outmoded and fallacious in theory.

The schools and colleges had practically lost all con-

nection or interest in George's teachings and if any mention was made in the economics courses, it was perfunctory and confined to a discussion of the "Single Tax" as a fiscal reform, with no discussion of the broad aspects of justice and economic freedom that are involved in any intelligent treatment of the subject.

The first duty, then, was to prepare an edition of "Progress and Poverty," and "Protection Or Free Trade," the two most important writings of George. This was done, and over 1,500 libraries throughout the country were presented with copies of "Progress and Poverty." At the same time, work was begun upon an abridgement which would attract those who felt they could not take the time to read the unabridged work. Our first President, Mr. Charles T. Root, conferred with John Dewey, and obtained from him the very beautiful "Appreciation of Henry George" which appears in the little abridgement which was finally evolved from the pen of Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, and which is entitled, "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty."

The Foundation began an advertising campaign to build up the name and fame of Henry George, and throughout the years of its work, has attracted thousands of outsiders to a reading of George through this method of printing George's writings and then advertising them either in newspapers and magazines, or by direct mail. Lately, the Fund, having diminished somewhat, has not been able to sustain this advertising, but the contacts made during the years when this work was carried on, have been the basis for nation-wide activity. Many of the people so attracted, are now students of Henry George, having "followed through" by reading not only "Progress and Poverty," but other writings, and they have become leaders of classes in cities throughout the country, as established by the Henry George Extension Class programme.

Not only has the Foundation placed George's books, one by one, in print, and obtained for them a place in the book stores of the country, and a nation-wide distribution among individuals, but it has maintained in its office a voluminous correspondence from the year 1926 to date, which has been effective in the following manner:

Inquiries were answered; suggestions were given where people expressed a desire to do constructive work in their communities; news of progress was disseminated to people long out of touch; and in short, field work tending to keep the movement together and stimulate activity was accomplished through this consistent attention to correspondence.

The people on our lists constituted a nucleus and the beginning of what might be a national enrollment, and there is in this office an index card for every active Single Taxer, which is literally a picture of the extent of in-

terest the individual has displayed during the past years.

Much of the favorable attitude of the press can be traced to the quality and timeliness of material sent to editors at stated intervals. This work of late has been extended to include radio commentators, and since these men in many cases conduct syndicated news columns, the publicity is extensive if the material sent happens to interest them to the point of writing on it.

When books were launched, reviews were made up with adequate information of the history and subject ready to hand for the editors' use. The clippings from the press have been watched over a period of years, and favorable editorial comment has been noted and made use of wherever possible.

The Foundation considers that it has accomplished something very definite in the schools and colleges. It has obtained the interest of the teachers of economics in many of the major universities, and it has kept every economics department advised twice a year of the material available for teaching Henry George in the economics course. We have reported from time to time in the pages of this magazine, the comments of educators. The latest received is merely a postcard from a teacher in a Southern college, who says:

"I am anxious to secure a picture of Henry George for our economics classroom collection. I am requiring my students in advanced theory to read "Progress and Poverty."

Briefly the statistics as to the book distribution are:

41,762 "Progress and Poverty," both abridged and unabridged.

16,652 other Henry George titles.

58,414 Total since 1926.

Over 800,000 pamphlets and tracts.

It may be noted that in the forty-five years from 1897 to 1932, the figures on the distribution of George's books by the publishers who formerly handled them, are 57,000 volumes, or, the approximate equal for forty-five years of our nine years work.

Our President, Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, who has been president since 1927, is also honorary head of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, an international organization that keeps in touch through the London office of *Land and Liberty*, conducted by Arthur Madsen, with Georgists throughout the world.

Much correspondence is maintained in the Foundation office with foreign Single Tax groups. It was our president's splendid inspiration to invite Lord Snowden to this Tenth Annual Congress, and while Lord Snowden could not attend, he sent the magnificent statement to the Congress which appears elsewhere in this issue.

This letter has received comment from the press asso.



ciations. Our president was also instrumental in the preparation of that remarkable document entitled, "Economic Causes of War and Industrial Depression," which was presented to the League of Nations at Geneva in May, 1927.

There are two conclusions that Single Taxers and others who read this article might well arrive at. One is, that the work of the Foundation is not merely book publication and distribution, but a broader, deeper service to the cause. A service that is carried past the time when the individual gets the book, on into the time when, through a reading of it, he becomes interested. At that point the Foundation places him in touch with the Henry George School in order that he may go forward to a systematic study of Henry George, and a widening of personal influence for the cause in his community.

The other conclusion we would have the reader reach is, that the work of the Foundation has been on a stable basis, that it has been effective and constructive at all times, and carried on at some periods under great difficulties because the Fund which was left,—modest to begin with,—has not been large enough to yield an income sufficient to carry on the work upon any scale commensurate with the needs as they are today.

There has been no extra overhead, the work being carried on by "dollar-a-year" men of the Board, and by the undersigned as paid secretary, with exactly one office helper.

Any aid that can be given to supplement the Fund, or to augment its usefulness in the future, will indeed be a worthy and fruitful action. All support that can be given in distribution of pamphlets and books will help the general printing fund. All word that can be given to newcomers about the Foundation and about the books will immensely help our cause.

IT is now recognized at least that there is a social problem of distribution. That much is gained. No longer do we hear from the impenetrably thoughtless that men are poor because they are lazy or improvident. Ten million men seeking employment and unable to find it have finally stilled that stupid explanation. Other stupidities have taken its place, but this one is banished forever. Too many of those who are *not* improvident have seen their savings swept away as the avenues of employment closed against them.

CAN you imagine an embalming a library of works on political economy? Just a collection of mummies. And would you not feel very much like the American in "Innocents Abroad" who refused to take any interest in mummies and wanted to see instead a "good live corpse." These mummies will soon seem so ancient that we will be justified in voicing such a request. Already these writers seem to belong to a remote antiquity—there is not a nice fresh corpse among them.

## From the Rt. Hon. Viscount Snowden

DEAR MR. HENNESSY:

I thank you for your cordial invitation to attend the Congress of the followers of Henry George which is to be held in New York at the end of September.

I much regret that I am unable to undertake the long journey, but I would like to send you a few lines to express my best wishes for the success of the gathering.

There never was a time when the need was greater than it is today for the application of the philosophy and principles of Henry George to the economic and political conditions which are scourging the whole world.

The root cause of world's economic distress is surely obvious to every man who has eyes to see and a brain to understand. So long as land is a monopoly, and men are denied free access to it to apply their labor to its uses, poverty and unemployment will exist. When the land monopolists do permit the use of land they do so on terms which extort its full economic value.

Speaking of England particularly, there never was a time when land values were increasing so rapidly, and it is not an unrelated fact that for the last few years we have had the largest volume of unemployment in our history.

At the time I write Europe is trembling on the brink of an Imperialist War, the magnitude and consequences of which no man can calculate. The root cause of this impending conflict is land acquisition for the purpose of alien exploitation. All the diabolical machinery of modern warfare is to be employed to crush the independence of a defenseless State and to appropriate its land.

In its saner moments every country admits the ruin which is being inflicted on world trade by protection and other methods of artificially created hindrances to the free flow of Commerce; but selfish interests and a perverted nationalism keep the nations in economic bondage.

Great Britain's departure from Free Trade has been a disaster, not only to herself but to the world at large. We no longer can set an example to the world of the advantages of a Free Trade policy. Our Protectionist policy is corrupting the political life of the country and creating vested interests at the expense of the community.

Permanent peace can only be established when men and nations have realized that natural resources should be a common heritage, and used for the good of all mankind. It is to inculcate this fundamental truth that your Congress is meeting, and I hope the day is not far distant when it will be universally appreciated; and then will be the age of Freedom based on Eternal Justice.

## Remarks of Clifford H. Kendal

IN my opinion it is time for the followers of Henry George to stand for what he advocated and not for what he opposed. For years we have followed a so-called liberal policy toward Socialism notwithstanding George opposed it both in his speeches and writings.

If the philosophy of Henry George is really understood it will be found one of pure individualism. It follows basic law, viz, inherent rights only in the individual, and the creation of the State by the individual as an instrument of public service, the State having no inherent rights but only temporary conferred powers.

Also I feel we have come to a time when we should be outspoken in our condemnation of the New Deal and what it has done, its poverty-breeding, socialistic attempts to cure the depression, thereby retarding even temporary recovery.

I feel quite certain that most of you, based as you are on fundamental economics, will agree with me in this matter, and, in the absence of resolutions, will do all you can to let it be known that we

stand for the real rights of property, that we oppose confiscation, restriction of production, sales taxes, etc.

Business is sick and is growing sicker still of recurring industrial depressions, at the same time feeling that such visitations are inevitable. Every legitimate and productive interest cannot afford to do otherwise than investigate the teachings of Henry George. For the alternative and probable course of events is Socialism or Communism, short production, money tinkering, inflation, and government interference with business. Opposed to all this Henry George offers a simple and constructive programme based on natural law, a system of sound economics and a true basis of statesmanship.

I repeat, it is time to take our stand against Socialism and let the world know that what we advocate is in line with sound finance, sound business and encouragement of initiative and in all things, in conformity with the natural order.

## Extension Classes of the Henry George School

AS the Henry George School of Social Science opens its third school year we find its classes in forty-two cities of the United States, two in Canada and one in Mexico, with prospects of extensions of the School being established in England, New Zealand, and other countries.

No one can see between the lines of this record of growth from one class in 1933, without sensing its significance.

100,000 active Georgists in America!

This is the immediate goal of the School. You can help attain it in five years or less by becoming one of a thousand teachers to use "Progress and Poverty" as the textbook and the Teachers' Manual as a guide. What others are doing you can do. These are some of the cities where classes are opening this fall:

### ALABAMA

SELMA. *Instructor:* William H. Dinkins, A. M., President, Selma University.

### CALIFORNIA

GLENDALE. *Instructor:* Hollis C. Joy, 1850 Verdugo Knolls Drive.

LONG BEACH. *Instructor:* F. Darwin Smith, President, California College of Commerce.

LOS ANGELES. *Extension Secretary for Southern California:* C. W. Silvernale, 7356 Willoughby Avenue.

PASADENA. *Instructor:* George E. Lee, 1900 Paloma Street.

SANTA ANA. *Instructor:* Ben E. Tarver, Suite 418, Otis Bulding.

### CONNECTICUT

NORFOLK. *Instructor:* Joseph R. Carroll.

STRATFORD. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Lee, 219 Burritt Avenue.

WATERBURY. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. Royal E. S. Hayes, 314 W. Main Street.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, 2309 N. Custis Road, Clarendon, Va.

## ILLINOIS

CHICAGO. *Extension Secretary:* Maurice Welty, 4833 Dakin Street.

OAK PARK. *Extension Secretary:* J. Edward Jones, 137 N. Marion Street.

PEORIA. *Extension Secretary:* Albert Henniges, 326 Harrison Street.

## MASSACHUSETTS

ANNISQUAM. *Instructor:* James B. Ellery.

BOSTON. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Zara du Pont, 32 Shepard Street, Cambridge.

SANDWICH. *Instructor:* Lincoln Crowell.

SOUTH EGREMONT. *Extension Secretary:* John M. Miller.

## MICHIGAN

CEDAR SPRINGS. *Instructor:* J. S. Tindall.

DETROIT. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Palmer, 1257 National Bank Building.

GRAND RAPIDS. *Extension Secretary:* M. Herman Friedrich, 701 Livingston, N.E.

## MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS. *Instructor:* Louis B. Schwartz, 310 McKnight Building.

## MISSOURI

KANSAS CITY. *Extension Secretary:* Edward White, 300 La Salle Building.

SPRINGFIELD. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. J. V. Boswell, 823 Woodruff Building.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

EAST ALSTEAD. *Instructor:* Hartley Dennett.

## NEW JERSEY

NEWARK. *Instructor:* Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen, Jacksonville Road, Towaco, N. J.

WESTFIELD. *Instructor:* Edwin J. Jones, 311 Prospect Street.

## NEW YORK

BROOKLYN. *Instructor:* John Luxton, 496 E. 46th Street.  
*Instructor:* David Chodorov, Executive's

Secretarial Training School, 1560 Flatbush Avenue.

BRONX. *Instructor:* Max Berkowitz, 655 E. 223rd Street.

MIDDLETOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Z. K. Greene, 39 Washington Street.

NEW YORK CITY. *National Headquarters:* O. K. Dorn, Business Manager, 211 West 79th Street.

SCHENECTADY. *Extension Secretary:* W. W. Munro, R. D. No. 3.

## OHIO

CINCINNATI. *Extension Secretary:* E. E. Hardcastle, Union Central Life Insurance Co.

CLEVELAND. *Extension Secretary:* Virgil D. Allen, 2304 Bellfield Road, Cleveland Heights.

COLUMBUS. *Extension Secretary:* J. H. Kauffman, 403 State House Annex.

YOUNGSTOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Charles C. McGowan, 25 S. Hazel Street.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

BEAVER. *Instructor:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PHILADELPHIA. *Extension Secretary:* Julian P. Hickok, 315 Zeralda Street.

PITTSBURGH. *Extension Secretary:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building.

SOMERSET. *Instructor:* Ernest O. Kooser.

#### TEXAS

HOUSTON. *Instructor:* Mrs. Bessie Beach Truehart, 5308 Almeda Road.

#### WASHINGTON

ALDERWOOD MANOR. *Instructor:* W. H. Proctor.

TACOMA. *Instructor:* Robert S. Doubleday, 2306 S. Yakima Avenue.

#### CANADA

MILK RIVER, ALBERTA. *Instructor:* J. B. Ellert.

TORONTO, ONTARIO. *Instructors:* Alan C. Thompson, 100 Lombard Street. Miss Dorothy E. Coate, Rousseau, Ontario.

#### MEXICO

MONTEREY. *Instructor:* E. S. Westrup, Ave Morales 132, Ote.

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.

## Congress Notes

Mrs. Adeline T. Muhlenberg who covers for this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM the first two sessions of the Henry George Congress is a graduate of John Luxton's Brooklyn class of the Henry George School. She is a worthy pupil of that highly capable teacher. The others who reported the Congress for this issue are all members of the Students' Alumni.

At every recurring Henry George Congress Abe Waldauer asks us the question, "Will I see the Single Tax before I die?" And our answer has always been "Yes." As Abe seems rather anxious about it, and does not ask the question merely to keep in practise, we are going to predict publicly in anticipation of the same inquiry next year that he will live to see it.

It was good to meet old friends and a lot of new ones. The daughter of our old friend Charlie Fuller, Miss C. H. Fuller of Middletown, N. Y. especially interested us because we were a close friend of her father who passed away several years ago. She is an enthusiastic adherent of the Georgist philosophy.

Mayor McNair who has a habit of doing unexpected things, has offered our friend Abe D. Waldauer the office of City Attorney of Pittsburgh. We fancy that the people of Memphis think too much of him to let him go.

John Lawrence Monroe told of the progress of the Extension Classes on Thursday afternoon of the Congress. He said in part: "A year ago I completed a month's tour of the South and West. I visited Mississippi where Dr. Copeland carried on his heroic campaign. During my visit to many cities I saw that we were handicapped by the fact that only a few were familiar with our philosophy. In the Henry George School I discovered the method of bringing the sub-

ject to the people. In Cleveland Peter Witt gave a talk over the radio which elicited over 1,000 inquiries and resulted in the formation of classes in which 240 were enrolled. There are now over forty cities which have classes and these should reach 100 at the end of the year."

Young Billy Truehart of Houston, Texas, one of the most interesting figures at the Congress, showed a familiarity with our principles and a knowledge of "Progress and Poverty" remarkable in one so young.

Mr. M. Van Veen spent a whole day in showing Mrs. Truehart and Billy the sights of the city.

As a repercussion of the Tenth Henry George Congress the Henry George Club of Pittsburgh held a meeting to listen to reports of the Congress from Mayor McNair, Congressman Moritz, Robert C. Bowers, and Richard E. Howe.

Hon. George Foster Peabody, old friend of Lord Snowden, joined with Charles O'Connor Hennessy in a separate invitation to the former to attend the Congress. In another column will be found the admirable letter of Lord Snowden explaining why he was unable to be present.

We regret that Mr. J. B. Ellert, of Milk River, Alberta, did not give a full account of the experiment on Single Tax lines in that town. The Congress would have heard something constructive and inspiring. At the Henry George School on Monday, Sept. 30, he reviewed the history of what had been done in Milk River. It seems to us that here is a magazine story of unusual interest, which, with pictures of the town, would appeal to the editor of some popular periodical.

The success of the Congress was due not solely to its capable chairman Edward P. Donovan, but to the efficient cooperation of Mrs. B. W. Burger, Otto Dorn and John Lawrence Monroe. These persons deserve special mention.

P. R. Williams in his speech at the opening session said: "I cannot announce the discovery of any royal road to the triumph of our principles, but I do feel that we are making progress along many lines. Among these is the election of several of our believers to Congress. We have also found a new instrument in educational methods in the Henry George School."

Mr. Charles Erwood who reports the evening session of the first day of the Congress is librarian of the Henry George School, which is well on its way to the ownership of 5,000 volumes required as one of the conditions of the renewal of the School's charter two years from date.

We regret that Miss Helen D. Denbigh was not heard from. To her more than to any one is due the starting of the Henry George Fellowship. But readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will hear from her soon. In this connection it is pleasing to announce the receipt of Number One of *The Henry George Fellowship News* from Chicago.

Phelps Phelps, who has given some very interesting Henry George talks over the radio, but who says that he is not a Single Taxer, dropped in to look us over.

Ashley Mitchell of Huddersfield, England, whom many of our New York readers will remember, was unable to attend the Congress. He wrote: "I hope you will have a very successful Henry George Congress. Am delighted to know that Arthur Madsen and Mr. Folke are to be with you."

Albert Firmin, former postmaster of Brooklyn, held the attention of the audience with his resonant voice and his oratorical ability. Mr. Firmin is one of the best loved veterans of the movement.

We were glad to see our old friend "Larry" Henry at the Congress. He brought with him certain banners from the '86 campaign which were placed on display. Mr. Henry was accredited delegate to the Congress from his local union. He is 78 years of age but still full of enthusiasm for the cause.

## The Importance of Free Trade

STEPHEN BELL AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

IT is not my purpose to explain to you the merits of free trade, for you understand them as well as I do. It is unnecessary to tell you that Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade" is a classic, for you know that too. But it may be in order to remind some of you that the book is half a century old, that the tariff map of the world has changed considerably in that time, and the universality and stringency of trade strangulation today make the matter of commercial freedom more important than ever before. It is my desire to help you in visualizing the supreme importance of free trade in our larger philosophy of complete economic freedom.

Too many of us have taken at more than face value the dictum that advancing rent will absorb the gains that may result from free trade, even as it has absorbed the lion's share of the gains from other improvements and reforms.

Fifty years ago, when George wrote, Protectionism was in its infancy as compared with what it is today. It was merely an irritating, stinging sea nettle as compared with the giant octopus it is now, with its tentacles embracing the earth and strangling the trade of all nations, the trade that is the lifeblood of civilization, since without it civilization must languish and die.

Yet in 1888 Henry George thought the matter so important that he broke with many of his best and closest friends—even with that great soul whose memory we all delight to honor and revere, Father McGlynn, who was even then under the ban of excommunication by his church for having taken up the cross of this crusade,—in order to support Grover Cleveland for the Presidency on the mere chance that he might do something for free trade.

I would invite you to read again the concluding chapter of "Protection or Free Trade," you who regard tariffs as a side issue, and see for yourselves in the light of subsequent events the prophetic insight which inspired it.

I have said that Protectionism is strangling the trade that is the lifeblood of civilization. Why did Germany plunge the world into war? For a place in the sun. Free trade would have given it to her.

Why has Japan entered upon a career of expansion and conquest on the Asiatic mainland? For a place in the sun. Free trade would give it to her.

Why is Italy crying for more room and threatening the peace of the world? For a place in the sun which only free trade can give her.

Free trade, and only free trade, can give to every nation, great or small, rich or poor in natural resources, progressive or backward, its rightful place in the sun, opening to all of them all the resources of the earth through the channels of mutually profitable commerce.

I believe that Solomon had our philosophy of economic freedom in mind when he said:

"There is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty?"

Certain it is that the poverty of the world is due to its greed, the desire of the nations to keep their prosperity to themselves and to allow none of it to leak over their boundaries.

Too many of our people are afraid of the tariff question. I've heard them say they seldom or never start a discussion of the tariff because it seems to close the mind of the prospect to any discussion of the Georgean philosophy whatever. Well, it's just as easy to close the mind of a prospect by leading off with a discussion of the land question as it is with the tariff. My own experience is that the tariff offers one of the easiest and safest openings for a discussion of the broader philosophy of economic liberty which will give to all humanity its place in the sun by freeing all industry and trade from strangling restrictions and the burdens of taxation that should be borne by our real *commonwealth*, the values which populations and their activities create in the land.

Why do men fear that with free trade we would spend all our money abroad for cheap goods, and so allow our home industries to die? Do they not know that we can't spend American money abroad any more than foreigners can spend foreign moneys here?

Money is not migratory. It stays where it can circulate. Our merchants and manufacturers will not sell their goods abroad for foreign money. Foreign merchants and manufacturers will not sell their goods here for American money. Each wants the money of his own country. It is the function of exchange banking to be the medium through which exporters and importers exchange their credits, so that each can pay and be paid in the money he desires.

In normal times one may gauge the way in which the tides of trade are running by the movement of the foreign exchange market. Frank A. Vanderlip has called the exchange markets of the world the "international scale pans," and no more effective instrument exists for discouraging excessive importing or excessive exporting than the balance of the international scale pans, which, however, may be thrown out of balance when government credit in the form of great foreign loans are thrown into them.

Why cannot the so-called war debts of our associates

in the World War be paid? Because, while their moneys are worthless here, we prevent them from securing through trade the dollar credits necessary for their payment.

Why cannot the countries whose national and municipal governments and corporations borrowed large sums after the war for the rehabilitation of their industries, pay these debts, which amount to about as much as the war debts? The reason is the same.

You may wonder why and how those countries borrowed dollars, though dollars do not circulate abroad. They did not borrow them to take them abroad. They borrowed them to pay for American machinery, equipment, raw materials and foodstuffs, and it was for this purpose that the foreign governments threw their credit into the international scale pans. What we really loaned abroad was goods and services, and it is goods and services we must take in repayment, or let the debts go unpaid. In the face of this invincible fact, however, we have twice raised our tariff to prevent this kind of payment, and have even added insult to injury by calling our debtors "defaulters" and "welchers" for not paying.

It is the strain of trying to meet these commercial obligations with gold which has upset the gold standard itself, and this strain is an effective bar to currency stabilization.

Trade is a two-way traffic, and to stop it one way is to stop it both ways. We see its effects in the shrinking of agricultural products which began many years ago, backing these products up on a domestic market unable to absorb them until they smashed prices by their sheer weight. The foreigner could not buy here because we made it next to impossible for him to sell here. All this has helped immeasurably in breaking down the domestic market for manufactured goods of every description and scattering unemployment and destitution over this country and the world.

Now the primal motive for all trade is to acquire things we want and have not, and the thing we offer in exchange or sell in order to acquire the wherewithal to buy is merely the means by which we expect to get the thing we want. Let free trade liberate the consumer demand of the world if we truly desire to set the wheels of industry humming again.

Why are we trying to cure want in the midst of plenty by reducing the plenty? Because we refuse to liberate that consumer demand. These trade-strangling tariffs are costing the nations not only their prosperity, but their security and peace as well. Richard Cobden said of the anæmic half-baked free trade of the Manchester school that it was the *best* peacemaker. The late Henri Lambert of Belgium, who understood our brand of free trade, declared it to be the *only* peacemaker.

I have never known any other man whose mind worked so clearly and so independently along the lines blazed by Henry George as did the mind of this Belgian nobleman, who not only disdained the use of his title but was

suspect as a "defeatist" and "pro-German" during the war because of his clear diagnosis of the causes of the war and his insistence on their removal. He became intimate with Col. House, and to his influence I have attributed the third of President Wilson's famous "Fourteen Points" for settling the war—the one calling for the elimination of economic barriers. And I have attributed the break between President Wilson and Colonel House to the discarding of these Fourteen Points at the Versailles Peace Conference.

In my talks with Henri Lambert he disclosed a thorough understanding of the Georgan philosophy, but he maintained that George had unduly subordinated free trade in order to push the land question to the front, and he explained his attitude in this wise:

"The land question is basic, fundamental, and the popular mind, never profound, cannot be led to consider so fundamental a reform under conditions that exist today. War and the fear of war oppress the nations continually, and the hard conditions of life make it well-nigh impossible to think of anything else. Here in Europe the fear of war is always with us. No generation has escaped it. Our thoughts are centered on making our borders secure, to the exclusion of everything else. Therefore you will pardon me if I decline to be turned from my purpose of realizing for Europe a *Pax Economica*."

Henry George revealed to us the rock on which previous free trade philosophies had been wrecked, and we owe him eternal gratitude for showing to us the glories to which true free trade, or full economic freedom, will yet lead the world, but he overshot his mark when, without intending it, he allowed many of us to regard commercial freedom as a mere subordinate part of the broader philosophy.

In the work of the Henry George School of Social Science too much attention cannot be given to "Protection or Free Trade." George's book is a classic, but it is half a century old, and in that time trade strangulation has assumed forms and phases he little dreamed of.

Our great need is for a text book which, without omitting or altering any of the principles set forth by Henry George, shall bring this surpassingly important matter up to date.

**S**INGLE TAXERS will smile over a few words in Bernard Shaw's recent address to the left-wing Laborites in England. As reported in the *New York Times*, he said:

"They pay rent in Russia, but the difference is that here we pay rent to a gentleman who may go and blow it all at Monte Carlo. In Russia you pay rent to the local Soviet, which uses it for public purposes, of which you get the benefit. In other words, the people of London are fools; the people of Moscow are sensible."

ALICE STONE in *Unity*.

## Loyal Discipleship

**S**INGLE TAXERS, always optimistic and zealous, see a revival of interest in their movement in which they are attempting to enlist the interest of youth. At their tenth annual convention last week it was announced that the Henry George School of Social Science, established in New York three years ago, has branches in thirty-eight cities and it is hoped to increase the number soon to a hundred. They are taking advantage of current interest in economic problems to attract attention to this old proposal to cure the ills of society.

It is fifty-six years since George, a native Philadelphian, wrote "Progress and Poverty," and thirty-eight since his death. His book made him world famous. An enthusiastic Single Tax movement started in this country and rapidly gained adherents in England and the British dominions. In 1886 George, backed by labor in his candidacy for Mayor of New York City, ran ahead of Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican candidate, and gave Tammany a tight squeeze.

The Single Tax movement soon lost its first impetus and slowed down. It has always had devoted adherents preaching the George Gospel with almost religious fervor and setting an example to the advocates of other movements by their persistence. A real Single Taxer is never pessimistic, said one of the speakers at the New York gathering.—*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*.

## A New Definition of Embezzlement

**T**HE American Petroleum Industries Committee has long been complaining, with justice, of the disproportionate share of taxation to which the industry is subjected, as well as the many ways in which unscrupulous dealers evade these taxes, to the injury of their more honest fellows. It has followed up this noble work with one equally noble in intention but less so in conception. It would aid the government in preventing tax evasion while lightening the general burden, and would do it by means of a "model law" which it asks all the States to adopt.

We are particularly entranced with the one providing that failure to pay is to constitute an embezzlement of public funds. Thus the legitimate earnings of a gasoline dealer, or at least a portion of these earnings, are to be tagged as "public funds," to withhold which is a felony.

Of course this is done constantly by our tax laws without saying anything about it, but this express labeling private earnings as public funds invites inquiry as to what kind of funds the publicly created value or rent of land constitutes. No one pretends that this is even earned by the landowner.

## Telegram From London

**T**HE following telegram was received by Arthur Madsen and read at the Henry George Congress:

"Conference held under the auspices of City Council of Cardiff carried resolutions demanding power from Parliament to levy local taxes on land values. At conference there were ninety-six delegates, representing forty-four municipalities and other local governing bodies in Wales. Resolutions now being sent by Cardiff City Council to 2,000 municipalities and other local governing bodies in England and Wales."

### A NIBBLE, ANYWAY

In Perigord, France, where they use pigs to root up truffles, it is found that unless the pigs get some of the truffles they stop digging.

Bureaucrats, tax collectors, please note that not even pigs will go on working if somebody takes away all that is dug.

*London Express.*

## An Important Meeting In Los Angeles

**T**HE opening speech of a movement to establish a unicameral legislative system in California was delivered at a recent Municipal League Forum in Los Angeles. The speaker was that veteran Democrat of Democrats and steadfast Georgist, Laurie J. Quinby of Hollywood. Mr. Quinby has never passed up an opportunity to promote true Democracy.

Over twenty years ago, as a Nebraska State Senator, he was criticized for promoting a constitutional amendment calling for a one-house legislature in that State. The next session of law makers in Nebraska will be unicameral.

Men of the Quinby calibre should be sent to California's State Capitol to replace the horde of blatant demagogues now there. And why not the "Sage of Hollywood" himself?—C. W. SILVERNALE.

**I**T was at the session on the Malthusian Theory at the Teachers' Training Class of the Henry George School of Social Science when one of the students referred to the fact that the population of the world could be housed in the State of Texas but the teacher understood him to say taxes in place of Texas. After the laughter subsided the teacher said: "Right, the population of the world could be housed in Texas and they could all be buried in taxes."

## Contemplating the Here and Now

**T**HE whole world seems at the present time experiencing a fearful unrest. The adjective "fearful" is not used inadvisedly. Many economic physicians are prescribing for the disease (lack of ease), but are apparently heeding symptoms only, and studiously avoiding causes. Several reasons may be attributable for this attitude. Symptoms are multitudinous and require little proof and less thought to declare, and one can, and most all of us do, see symptoms, while causes are few in number and may possibly be reduced to one outstanding fact which requires reason and logic to prove.

Mental laziness, then, has largely to do with a solution. Physicians who prescribe lake water with a Latin label are careful that their patients are kept ignorant of the subterfuge; likewise, there are many economic physicians, who know the truth, but are reluctant to advise the remedy openly, knowing that the world is apparently not yet ready to be free. To acquire freedom it becomes necessary to exert, at least in some degree, mental initiative.

It is a well-known fact that there are but two primal, fundamental factors in the human physical activities, namely, Man and the Earth. The question naturally arises, Does this generation possess sufficient knowledge and efficiency to extract from the earth their daily needs? "Give us this day our daily bread," has a deep significance when considering the apprehensions most of us entertain regarding the needs of tomorrow.

The fear of want is the compelling motive to store for future use and has been carried to excess by some, the gaining of which has kept them so occupied that their brother's needs have been entirely overlooked, together with that bit of philosophy which teaches that what rightly benefits one benefits all; also, the plan eventually spells failure and chaos—then change. The law of justice is always present and the necessity for making it manifest is gradually coming into the consciousness of the afore-said brother. Universal thought is today shaping itself on a new basis, which had best be recognized, and instead of being led into vague notions leaning toward socialistic doctrines, something along the line of fundamental Natural Laws will be considered. The trouble lies, of course, in the improper distribution of our wonderful gift of supply, and instead of permitting it to be monopolized by a few, we should reason that what is provided by the Creator without our aid or knowledge, must ostensibly have been intended for all. Placing our earth supply in the same category as the air and sunshine might aid us in this solution, and substituting superficial expediency for Natural Law with expectation of favorable results, promises to be a gigantic undertaking, involving untold ramifications.

Seeking every avenue for taxing labor products, and ignoring the scientific method of taxing the source, the monopoly of the earth, to the value of which all contribute, this reasoning, of course, is too simple for our experts to contemplate. It implies no statistical elaboration, historical data, nor prognostication anent the future; it merely contemplates the Here and Now. —F. J. EDDY.

**G**RUESOME stories of conditions in Russia appear in none too veracious Hearst papers. Whether true or false no denial by the Soviet government or its American champions can be trusted, since prohibition in Russia of hostile criticism constitutes an implied admission that the government has much evil to hide. The only way the Soviet administration can clear itself is by making hostile criticism as safe in Moscow as in Washington or New York. Until this is done communist speakers and writers must be classed as talking ignorantly or mendaciously.

**I**F the Wright brothers had needed an Act of Congress before they could have experimented with an airplane there would be no airplanes today. Had legislative permission been necessary before any one could try out an automobile we would still be in the horse and buggy age. Had Stephenson needed an Act of Parliament before being allowed to build a locomotive stage coaches would still be running. This explains why mechanical progress has outstripped progress in matters relating to government.

**I** AM glad to hear that you are engaged in an active campaign to make known the economic and fiscal ideas of Henry George. If the United States had hearkened to his warnings forty years ago it would have saved itself most of its present tribulations, so largely due to monopoly fostered by private control of land and natural resources. South Africa has the opportunity to avoid similar future catastrophe by adopting in time the principle that the land and its natural riches are not to be monopolized, but are for the good of all.

JOHN DEWEY, in letter to Mather Smith.

## What They Are Saying

### MEMORY OF HENRY GEORGE\*

Labor Day, by a suggestive coincidence, occurred yesterday upon the birthday of Henry George, making the occasion doubly worthy of attention.

Henry George—born Sept. 2, 1839, died Oct. 29, 1897. His fundamental message remains today no less fresh and pertinent than it was nearly four decades ago when he laid down his sword!

The world he lived in was, for practical purposes, not so large as it is now, not so swift-moving, not so complicated. But it was a world of the same immemorial difficulty and struggle. Against the evils of that world he fought with a courage that never turned aside, and for its problems he offered a philosophy of justice which is still living.

"Social progress makes the well-being of all more and more the business of each," declared Henry George. The world has changed much since he said that, but the most idealistic of the New Dealers goes no further is stating his basic principles.

And to the timid souls who shake their heads at the idea of reform in the recovery programme there could be no better answer than Henry George's pronouncement, "There is danger in reckless change, but greater danger in blind conservatism."

Henry George was steadfastly the upholder of the rights of men who lived by their own hard work. He belonged also, and just as much, to all those patriots and visionaries who march toward the hope of a fairer deal.

The inspired *New York World* bade him farewell thirty-eight years ago in these words:—

"Wherever men honor public and private virtue; wherever men are struggling to uplift their fellow-men, wherever men grope in the darkness of oppression, straining their eyes for the breaking of the dawn of liberty, the news will come as the tidings of the death of a friend. . . . Liberty has lost a friend! Democracy has lost a leader! Down with dictators!"—*N. Y. World-Telegram*.

EDITORIAL NOTE: We are grateful for this fine tribute to our leader. But we must point out that there is *nothing* in common between the doctrines of the New Dealers and the "basic principles" of Henry George. Indeed they are in irreconcilable conflict.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

### HENRY GEORGE IN CHINA

China would seem to be one of the world's poorest fields in which to disseminate the economic philosophy of Henry George. But Dr. Macklin didn't find it so.

During his four decades of service as a physician in a mission hospital, he found time to translate into Chinese Ida M. Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company," Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics," Green's "Short History of English People," Henry George's famous works, "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade," and about fifteen other works along similar lines.

\* \* \* \* \*

In the course of his work in China, Dr. Macklin had opportunity to become closely acquainted with Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the George Washington of the Chinese Republic.

In their discussions concerning the future of China, Dr. Macklin

presented to the Chinese revolutionary leader the Henry Georgian philosophy of making taxes on socially created land values the sole source of governmental revenue, and converted him to the idea.

GILBERT BROWN, columnist, in *Los Angeles Post Record*.

#### LORD KITCHENER, GEORGIST

Kitchener's Georgist laws in Transvaal are the most dramatic part of his life, in their re-emergence. But one ventures to think the grandly simple lines of his Sudan Code will fructify in greater boons, which are the more impressive when we recall Cromer's founding of a landed gentry in Egypt itself at the time. Honor to our brother!

MERVYN J. STEWART in *Melbourne Progress*.

#### KITCHENER'S LAND REFORM PROGRAMME

When Lord Kitchener became Viceroy of Egypt he found a condition similar to that which now exists in the United States. He might have built more pyramids so as to give employment to labor, but he did not. He caused the distribution of small tracts of public land to the people and these tracts were inalienable. They could not be mortgaged or sold. The holder of this land could only desert it and make room for a better man.

PRESCOTT A. PARKER in *New York Herald-Tribune*.

#### ALWAYS ENOUGH IN THE WORLD FOR ALL

"The Chart of Plenty," which Charles A. Beard thinks is the most important American book published in recent years, proves, in the words of Stuart Chase's introduction, that under a different system of property relationships "American industry could supply every family with a health and decency budget (from \$2,000 to \$2,500) and give in addition almost as much again in terms of comforts." Although I am an amateur in these matters, I can find flaws in what Mr. Loeb and Mr. Chase have to say about the potential capacity of the industrial machine, and I hereby apologize for not having mentioned "The Chart of Plenty" before this.

But too much can be claimed for books like "The Chart of Plenty." As Murray Godwin once pointed out, there has always been enough in the world for every one. What has always kept most people from getting a good living is monopolization by an elite of land and natural resources, as Henry George long ago explained. "Progress and Poverty" is still a far more important book than "The Chart of Plenty." And the really important work of showing how the political means of distributing an annual income of some \$4,000 to each family is to be devised is as yet unwritten. Until that book appears I refuse to get excited about the figures of our technocratic prophets of the "economy of abundance." We have always had a potential plenty of basic stuffs, even if it takes the machine to offer us a potential plenty of luxuries.—JOHN CHAMBERLAIN in *New York Times*.

#### FRIEND OF CAPITAL AS WELL AS THE FRIEND OF LABOR

The only reformer abroad in the world in my time who interested me in the least was Henry George, because his project did not contemplate prescription, but, on the contrary, would reduce it almost to zero. He was the only one of the lot who believed in freedom, or (as far as I could see) had any approximation to an intelligent idea of what freedom is, and of the economic prerequisites to attaining it.

\* \* \* \*

One is immensely tickled to see how things are coming out nowadays with reference to his doctrine, for George was in fact the best friend the capitalist ever had. He built up the most complete and absolutely impregnable defense of the right of capital that was ever constructed.—ALBERT J. NOCK in *July Atlantic*.

#### HENRY GEORGE IDEAS APPROVED IN SO. AFRICA

The May issue of the monthly journal, the *Industries of South*

*Africa*, published in Durban, contains a complete reprint of Henry George's "The Crime of Poverty."

An editorial note said "the arguments propounded by the Prophet of San Francisco, are arguments that apply even more forcibly to present day world conditions.

"Those of our readers who will read deeply and study carefully what Henry George has to say will find to their amazement that what he says is so right—so utterly and simply right—that the fundamental facts seem to have escaped more recent reformers of our social and economic systems in their seeking after complicated methods to right complicated wrongs."

*Land and Liberty*, London, England.

#### SPENDING LIKE A DRUNKEN SAILOR

\$24,206,533,000, representing the expenditure of Roosevelt's Administration, as estimated by the President—actual 1934 and estimated 1935 and 1936, a total of three years—means that the New Dealers are spending the taxpayers' money at the rate of \$15,351 per minute, or \$255 per second. That's something for our boys and girls of today—our taxpayers of the future—to look forward to.

*Wingold News Letter*, Bay State Milling Co., Winona, Minn.

#### A DEFINITION OF PRIVILEGE

In my thinking, privilege has to do with a favored position that enables a person to secure income at the expense of others, income for which he does not render an equivalent in goods or services to those from whom this income is drawn. The income of a monopolist, of a slave owner (even though he has bought his slaves from the previous owners), of a recipient of tariff or other government favors, and of a person whose income is derived mainly from the community-produced situation rent of land or sites, might all be spoken of as enjoying privileged income.

PROF. HARRY GUNNISON BROWN, in *St. Louis Star Times*.

#### WILL CANADIAN LABOR ACT ON ITS OWN RESOLUTION?

The All-Canadian Congress of Labor, at its annual convention in Montreal in May last, adopted certain "recommendations of policy" made by its Executive Board. Among these was one on the subject of *The Land*, reading as follows:

"The nation should re-assert the ownership of natural resources as an initial step in any fundamental reform of the economic system. The most important of all natural resources, the land, should be national property. The communally created value of land should belong to the community. To achieve this advance the Board recommends the advocacy of the gradual acquisition of all land values by taxation, the revenue so derived being applied first for the provision of housing for the workers."

This is the deliberately chosen policy of the Congress and it stands as such until—if ever—it is altered or rescinded by equally authoritative action of some future convention.

On the other hand, natural resources actually have been made private property to such an extent that the workers have been deprived of their fair share. This has been done throughout our civilization and in all ages of recorded history. This fact is about as obvious and as widely known as man's constant dependence upon natural resources. Not only that, but in all ages and all lands there have been protests against such a system. But those protests have been made, almost without exception, against some special grievance or to ward off some evil threatening the common welfare. The case that comes most readily to mind is that long-continued and systematic outrage by which the common lands of England were "enclosed" with the intent and effect of stealing them from the communities that owned them.

Has anything happened here in Canada to make it necessary for Labor to make a gesture of warning or protest? Many will say that things are going along just as they have always gone along and that



the All-Canadian Congress of Labor in adopting this "land" resolution is merely repeating a platitude or is looking for trouble.

A. C. CAMPBELL, in *Canadian Unionist*.

#### QUESTIONS OUR OPPONENTS MUST CONFUTE

To shatter Georgian economics it is only necessary to refute certain very simple propositions which Henry George propounds, illustrates and proves. Such propositions for example are:—

1. That man is entirely dependent upon land for his physical existence.
2. That this planet (land) is the gift of the Creator to all his creatures—not merely to the dress circle occupiers.
3. That the only real Landowner, the Creator, charges no Rent or the use of his land.
4. That rent only exists where human societies exist.
5. That at the fringes of society (if land be plentiful and not purposely held out of use) there will be no Rent.
6. That Rent is a natural phenomenon—as natural as any physical law—secreted as it were *only* by society, just as food is naturally secreted by the mother for the benefit of her young.
7. That land is the only source of wealth, and labor the only means by which wealth is produced.
8. That all taxation is a forcible extraction from the wages of labor.
9. That Rent is not an extraction from wages.
10. That Rent correctly applied to meet the expenses of government, eliminates the necessity for taxation, and thereby assures to labor the full value of the products produced.
11. That *wages* are the returns to labor, whilst Rent is the natural return due to society, being occasioned and caused by society as distinct from the individual.
12. That labor applied to land produces wealth.
13. That mere ownership of land contributes nothing to the production of wealth, though it often yields fortunes to owners.

*The Standard*, Sydney, Australia.

#### TAKE TAXES OUT OF PRICES

*The Wall Street Journal* has been harping on "Kept Apart by Price" for about a year now, and I hope that it continues harping on that same theme. Neither government nor legislation has any direct jurisdiction in the field of price fixing, for anything, and that includes wages, interest, rent and profits, but can control taxes and the expense of governmental activities. Legislators can "Take Taxes Out of Prices" by shifting them to the site value of land. They can cancel taxes with rent and they should do it now. That can and should be done gradually, one step at a time. The best place to start, I think, would be transportation taxes. That is the heaviest tax that everybody has to pay. By shifting ALL taxes from ALL carrier facilities, including gasoline, coal and oil, to ALL land values, urban and rural, irrespective of ALL improvements, would be killing, with one stone, two foul birds of prey, namely, exorbitant freight and passenger rates and fabulously high prices and rents for land, particularly in our larger cities. Legislators should learn about and become conscious of the limitations of statutes and, at the same time, put aside wishful thinking and wish-fulfilment devices and do things that are possible and which should be done in the public interest.

DR. C. J. LAVERY in *Dakota Free Press*.

#### THANKS, BROTHER TOEPFERT

It surely is becoming evident that a right solution of our tax problems is of the utmost concern, as you have said, in the affairs of every United States citizen. The modern development of the doctrines of Smith, Spencer, the French physiocrats and others of the "classic" period are carried out and elaborated in the teachings of Henry George, and in this connection it may be of interest to know that the Henry George School of Social Science, located in New York City

and chartered under the laws of the State, is establishing extension schools in the principal cities of the United States.

OSCAR A. TOEPFERT in *Christian Science Monitor*.

#### REAL ESTATE RACKETS

The field of real estate rackets has experienced a depression boom. . . . aimed at those who want to sell—debt-ridden suburbanites, harassed farmers, bedeviled merchants, bewildered widows. . . . "Cash for your home," "We buy real estate anywhere," or "Mortgage money available." . . . Rented desk room—"business address," cards printed: "Real estate appraisals." The stage was set for the ads in the "Money to loan" sections. "Advance fee" racket. "I've a client who wants to buy your place." . . . contract of sale . . . etc., etc. . . . "Building Corporation" represented as being very, very anxious to buy these tracts. . . . Payment . . . no cash but only interest-bearing mortgages, the terms of which the promoters had no intention of meeting. . . . they had accomplished their purpose, the collection of the advance fee, and had kept *within the law*.

The many Philadelphians who succumbed to the scheme didn't know that the lots for which they paid \$1,500 each—a large part in cash—had cost the promoters only \$75. each. This game is worked all over the country.

Free Lot scheme, and Lunch and Lecture scheme. "Once signed these contracts hold." Don't count too heavily on the law.

JEROME ELLISON in *Readers Digest* for August.

## BOOK REVIEWS

#### A USEFUL BOOK—WITHIN LIMITS\*

Here is a work typical of much that is being written in these days, and useful within limits.

Prof. Wallis has his fling at Henry George. It has become the habit of those who derive all they know from the master to present what they want to think is an original approach to the problem, so much more reasonable than Henry George himself, but which turns out to be the same thing under another name and a new setting, or some very much diluted form of it. For example, one of the subtitles of this work is "A New Approach to the Business Problem." It would be new if Henry George had not indicated the same avenue of approach fifty-five years ago. We wonder if it is just crass egotism that leads these writers to wrest piecemeal rocks from the great mountain and exhibit them as original discoveries. There is not a single statement in this book of Prof. Wallis that is not derived from "Progress and Poverty."

Perhaps the reader will ask for justification for these comments of the reviewer. We have it on page 58 and 59 of the work as follows:

"Mr. George, as we have shown, was not the first writer who pointed to land as a peculiar tax base; but he attracted worldwide attention for a time by linking economics, in oracular style, with utopian emphasis on Single Tax as a panacea for social ills. \* \* \* I concur in much that Mr. George says, but cannot count myself a disciple, and have experienced considerable difficulty in working with those who regard him as their master.

On the whole, then, the influence of "Progress and Poverty" at the present time is an obstacle in the way of sane economic readjustment; and with regard to this point, the views of many scholars are expressed by Prof. Edward A. Ross, of Wisconsin University, who writes me as follows: "I agree with you that by rearing a Utopia on the exclusive taxation of land, Henry George interrupted the rational evolution which was getting on toward recognizing land as peculiarly able to bear taxation."

This is pretty astonishing. Mr. George did much more than point to land as a peculiar tax base. Nor did he set himself to build a Utopia. If he dwelt upon the subject "in oracular style" (by the way, this sounds like a sneer) he did so because he saw the kind of a civilization that would result from the solution he offered. He had linked the law of wages with the law of rent. This was his great contribution to economic science. There had been many land re-

formers before him, but none had built the bridge over which in a much feebler way inferior thinkers had stumbled, or walked uncertainly. It is not surprising that Prof. Wallis found "considerable difficulty in working with those who regarded Henry George as their master." It is clear that he has only imperfectly sensed the teachings of Henry George in all their implications.

We are sad to learn that "Progress and Poverty" is "an obstacle in the way of sane economic readjustment." The remark is amusing, for it is doubtful indeed if Mr. Wallis' present volume would have emerged at all if Henry George had not inspired it.

But let us be grateful for small things. This book will be read by many who have not the intellectual capacity, nor perhaps the leisure, to examine what Henry George really taught. Much that precedes what we have quoted is well worth while. In this we include his examination of Marx, his explanation of the nature of capital, his relation of land to production, and the evils wrought by land speculation. These are all well done, and other comments of Prof. Wallis call for commendation.

Prof. Wallis suggests as a substitute for the name Single Tax, "Capretax," which strikes us as a name of equal futility.

It may be said, too, that the rejection of rights, or "Natural rights," on which George laid peculiar emphasis, forces Prof. Wallis to an acceptance of Bentham's principle of "The greatest good to the greatest number," the fallacy of which was pointed out by the clear-eyed Alexander H. Stephens many years ago.

All the points raised quite admirably by Prof. Wallis will find further augmentation in a better knowledge of Henry George, to whom all these arguments may be traced. And for the benefit of the student let us say that Henry George did not teach that land was "peculiarly able to bear taxation." It is not the taxation of land that he taught, and we wonder if it would not have been just as well to insist upon this throughout in the interest of truth and a better understanding. Indeed this has been done in what precedes the passage we have quoted and which is a negation of what has gone before.

All in all, it will still have to be said that this little work will do good among those who prefer to get their knowledge in derivative form.

J. D. M.

\*"Safeguard Productive Capital. Tax Ground Values and Untax Industry." By Louis Wallis. 12mo. Doubleday, Doran, Garden City, N. Y.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"Social Democracy" is the title of a twelve page pamphlet issued by the Order of Social Democracy of Georgia. It is signed by Howell Clopton Harris as secretary and he is presumably the author of this little work stating the aims and principles of the order.

The recommendations include political as well as economic changes. Of course, the collection of land values, or economic rent for public purposes, forms the first of these demands. We might be critical of some of the suggestions, but Mr. Harris is too good a Democrat to insist that his demands (in this instance the demands of the Order of Social Democracy of Georgia) are the last words of wisdom on the subject.

It should be said that on the fundamentals of economics Mr. Harris stands "four square." Wage and price-fixing, regimentation, tariffs, etc., are rejected for reasons that have been tested by experience. Certainly no party will go to the polls with a better programme than the Order of Social Democracy.

\* \* \*

"A Printer Tells the President," is a pamphlet of 32 pages by H. Ellenoff, consisting of questions and answers. This compact little arsenal of fact and reason is published by the author at 916 Carroll Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. at twenty-five cents a copy. The number of questions are forty-five and the answers include figures and statistics, with statement of authorities from many and varied sources.

We have no hesitation in saying that of all the pamphlets that have reached this office in a long period this is the most admirable and weighty. The answers to some of the President's statements are keen and searching. We cannot refrain from this single quotation "When man is denied his natural rights, the common reaction of governments the world over is to take on the functions not originally intended, such as prying into private affairs, the creation of jobs the exalted idea that it is the duty of government to make people happy. Man who is the product, the result of countless ages of evolution, can well take care of himself, provided he has free access to nature."

Perhaps because this little pamphlet is issued by an advertising man its typographical appearance is peculiarly appealing.

\* \* \* \* \*

Donald L. Thompson, of Spokane, Wash., is the author of a number of thoughtful pamphlets. The one before us is captioned "Our Deluded Over-Productionists" and is sold for fifteen cents a copy. It is written simply and is a sufficient answer to those who would reduce crops and limit production. The doctrine Mr. Thompson attacks and which is widespread he calls "an economic illusion," and proves it to any one who can be induced to peruse this easily read and easily understood little brochure.

\* \* \* \* \*

Here is another larger pamphlet which we heartily recommend though it is quite different from the three that have been noted in the foregoing. It is entitled "America's Tax Dilemma" and is published and presumably written by Herbert Atkinson, 148 Eighth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. It consists of 48 pages and can be had for 25 cents a copy.—J. D. M.

## Correspondence

### NOTICE TO OUR CORRESPONDENTS

With this number we bring to an end, so far as these columns are concerned, the controversy on Interest, whether Rent enters into Price, or whether under the full collection of Economic Rent any of the selling price of land remains.

The world is approaching a tragic hour. We are trembling on the brink of another World War. Whatever the outcome of the Italian Ethiopian squabble the danger is still upon us.

We are bringers of a World Peace. Our gospel is the gospel of plenty, of liberty throughout the world. We bring a message that will make war forever impossible. We preach the concord of nations the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man. And we know how to attain that condition. The future is ours if we will but obey the call.

Let us pray that it may not be too late. In the meantime the clouds are gathering. Civilization, such as it is, cannot survive a recurrence of what came upon us in 1914. Henry George has given us a great message, a message of emancipation from the terrors that are threatening, the dangers in which no household is safe, the loss of all that is generous and fine, the destruction of the culture and beauty that have taken centuries to build.

What shall be said of those of us who at such a time stop to discuss whether rent enters into price, or whether under the full collection of economic rent more or less shall be asked for the use of capital. Whether one or other of these schools be right matters but little. Our duty and responsibility are greater than these.

Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

### CONDITIONS IN KOREA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In the July number of *Asia* there appeared an article on Korea under twenty-five years of Japanese control. It is entitled "Japan

d the Korcan Farmer." The author is C. Martin Wilbur. According to *Asia* Mr. Wilbur has lived in Japan, China and Korea since the age of one, and was Reference Librarian at the College of Chinese Studies in Peiping during 1932-1934. Accordingly he should know the subject. It is quite evident that he knows the facts, but as to the logical relation of cause and effect he is utterly at sea.

He points out the terrible condition of the Korean farmer after a quarter of a century of guidance from the Yankees of the East. For instance: fifty-three per cent of the farmers are tenants. The average yearly income of tenant farmers after rent is paid, amounts to the equivalent of \$15.80, or about seventy-five per cent of what is necessary to support life by the lowest standard prevalent in Korea, or twenty-five per cent below the cost of living. Rents equal from fifty to eighty per cent of the harvest. In addition to this the tenant pays the land tax, and also gives presents in feudal fashion to the landlord and his family. More and more farmers are becoming bankrupts each year, going from bad to worse, and Japanese and city capitalists are getting possession of the ancestral acres. On top of this we have the astounding fact of an increase of over one hundred per cent in rice production, due to more efficient methods of farming. Still seventy-four per cent of the entire population are in decline in an economic way.

To what does Mr. Wilbur attribute this depression of Korea? He blames it upon the fecundity of the Koreans! He asserts that in twenty-three years these improvident people have had the audacity to increase in number fifty-three per cent! Think of it! While the cost of life has increased one hundred per cent in twenty-five years, digestive systems to handle that rice have increased but one-half! And in consequence three-quarters of the population are worse off than they were under the petrified civilization of the Hermit Kingdom twenty-five years ago. And yet Mr. Wilbur knows that the landlords get from fifty to eighty per cent of the Korean farmer's product of his labor in rent, and give in return absolutely nothing. And does Mr. Wilbur believe that if the population had increased but one-quarter or had even remained static, or declined, that the product of the farmer would be any better when fifty per cent to eighty per cent of his labor is lost to a parasite?

I have written to the editors of *Asia* showing the fallacy in Mr. Wilbur's reasoning, and pointing out the true cause, and they have notified me that they are interested in my conclusions and are sending me a letter to Mr. Wilbur so that he may reply to it himself.

JOHN LUXTON.

#### WE THINK MR. LOOMIS IS IN ERROR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My main contention in the discussion in which I have been taking part is that under the full Single Tax it is quite possible that land will have a genuine selling value. May I be allowed just a little more space?

If the landowner received only WAGES for the collection of taxes from sub-tenants or for other actual work, his retention of part of the rent would not show itself in a selling value of the land. I personally believe it will pay the State to allow him more than this, to allow him enough to give the land an actual selling value. How else will the State attain the objective referred to by Henry George of "avoiding the attempt to rent land through State agency?" This can be accomplished only by having land bought and sold as it is now. And for this purpose land must have a real selling value.

It is true that the State will get a service. I believe it will get it cheaper thus than in any other way. But it will get it by allowing land to have a selling value. On the other hand, the landowner will not get something for nothing, for the portion of the rent that he gets for this will tend to equal the interest on his investment.

I return now to my main contention, that it is quite possible for land to have a selling value under the full Single Tax.

H. B. LOOMIS.

NOTE—The selling value of land is an untaxed value. If there-

fore any selling value of land remains after we get the Single Tax it is proof we have fallen short of our purpose and that something is still due the community.

A typographical error crept into John Luxton's reply to Mr. Loomis on page 132 of the July-August issue, second column, 8th line. It should read one hundred per cent minus X per cent, *not plus*.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

#### TOUCHES A PROFOUNDER QUESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

May I add a few words to the memorial article on "The Passing of Frank Stephens" and of his views which may not be known to all of his friends.

His mother designed him for the ministry but due to theological differences he did not enter it. The only person with him to the last was the beloved nurse, Mrs. Marguerite Shanklin Wood, who has ministered to so many people in Arden.

Frank Stephens view of life was always intensely ethical and doubtless he took death in the stride. His service to ethical issues was marked—the popular nickname for him was "The Pope." His motto was action.

Perhaps religion will make no real advance until we so far progress as to have bona fide communication with those who have passed on. Advances in religion have always taken place with uphill effort against the opposition of cotemporary theology. Ignorance in official religions have retarded spiritual progress.

Lonsdale, R. I.

FLORENCE GARVIN.

#### A TRIBUTE TO FRANK STEPHENS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

A severe illness, which has kept me flat on my back for months, and from which I have not yet recovered, has delayed my tribute to Frank Stephens.

He was one of the whitest souls ever created and spent his life in unselfish devotion to his fellows.

In 1884 Frank Stephens, A. H. Stephenson, A. N. Chandler, R. L. Atkinson and Will Atkinson formed the Henry George Club of Philadelphia.

Stephenson was a very able speaker and debater, but exulted in making mince meat of those he met in debate and Stephen's time was largely taken up by trying to heal the wounds made by Stephenson.

When I started *Justice*, a Single Tax weekly, Stephens, Stephenson and Chandler were all associate editors.

That the Club was a vital force in the Single Tax movement for many years was very largely due to Frank Stephens.

Frank was staying at the Union Square Hotel and was the first to respond to Mrs. Henry George's call for help when Mr. George died.

I had gone that night to the George home at Fort Hamilton, at Henry George's request, to escort Anna George home. She had been at Father Ducey's meeting at Cooper Union at which he came out flatly for Henry George.

Capon Springs, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

RABBI MICHAEL AARONSOHN writes: "I have been keenly interested in Frank Chodorov's article in May-June issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, 'Wanted One Thousand Teachers.'"

DR. ADOLPH DAMASCHKE, leading land reformer of Germany, died July 31. He differed from Henry George in his teachings. He was the editor of the "Year Book of Land Reform and Social Questions," and founder of the Society for German Land Reform. In June, 1931, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize won that year by Eric Karefeldt, Swedish poet, and in 1919 and 1920 he was urged as a candidate for President of Germany. His published works are

numerous, among them being "The Problem of Communal Politics," "History of Political Economy," "History of the German Land Reform Movement," "The Art of Popular Speaking in Public," and many others. He assisted in the preparation of the Special Number of the *Single Tax Review* for Germany in 1912, an eighty-page illustrated number, one thousand copies of which issue were sent to Germany for distribution. It was not foreseen that two years later Germany and the world would be involved in the chaos of a great war. It is conceivable that events might have worked out very differently if the war had not intervened. The organization for land reform which he had founded and of which he was the head, came to naught on Hitler's ascent to power. Dr. Damaschke had married in 1904 Julia Geiser, daughter of a Jena professor, and three daughters were born of this union. A fuller account of his life and work appears in the "Single Tax Year Book" (1917) edited by Joseph Dana Miller and will be found on page 145 of that work from the pen of Joseph Danziger.

WE have received a letter from the secretary of Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It will be recalled that Frank Stephens dined at the White House at the invitation of Mrs. Roosevelt a few weeks before his sudden death. The letter reads as follows: "Mrs. Roosevelt asks me to thank you for the copy of LAND AND FREEDOM containing the article about Frank Stephens. She is very glad to have this and deeply appreciates your sending it to her."

ARTHUR W. ROEBUCK, Ontario's Attorney General, and long a Henry George man, in a recent address to more than 4,000 delegates of the Knights of the Khorassan, said: "I would like to see the day when there will be no one at the border going through our baggage looking for things which should not be there."

WE have received the September number of the *Roman Forum*. It is full of interesting matter and its discussion of current events is as usual wonderfully informative. The paper is published at one dollar a year and is well worth the subscription price. The *Roman Forum* edited by Dr. Frederick W. Roman is published at 214 Loma Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

DURING the Pittsburgh Jubilee held Aug. 19 to 24, Mr. John C. Rose had charge of the distribution of literature at the Assessors' booth. During the week he distributed all the good literature they had in Pittsburgh. Francis Maguire gave out literally tons of the literature remaining from the Joseph Fels Fund stock. During the Jubilee week one hundred and thirty persons were enrolled in the Henry George School of Social Science.

*The Universal Engineer* is an imposing monthly periodical of over 70 pages published at 150 Nassau Street and devoted to engineering. In the September number appears the address of John H. Allen on "Taxation" delivered before the Universal Craftsmen Council of Engineers. It is an uncompromising presentation of our philosophy. On another page appear carefully selected paragraphs from the work of J. P. Kohler, "Hard Times," which our readers need not be told are all that can be desired. These are arranged by Mr. Allen who asks: "Because our great grandfathers, our grandfathers, yes, our own fathers, have been content to struggle along under these ever-recurring depression-boom cycles is surely no reason why we should not correct the evil, in our own generation." Our congratulations to the publishers of this impressive periodical.

JOHN T. GIDDINGS of East Providence, R. I. appears with a number of Single Tax communications in the columns of the *Providence Journal* and the *Evening Bulletin*.

WE learn from Judge A. B. Pittman of Memphis, of the death of our old friend Louis N. Geldert, of a sudden heart attack. Mr.

Geldert was not a Single Taxer but he was a personal friend of the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM and a man of high character. When we were in Memphis on the occasion of the Henry George Congress he gave a luncheon in our honor and invited a number of his friends prominent in the city, among whom was Judge Pittman, the charming editor of the *Press Scimitar*, and the leading Unitarian clergyman of Memphis. He drove us around the city with Mrs. Geldert who passed away several months ago. She was a writer of distinction. We shall cherish the recollection of these two charming people who have passed from among us. Mr. Geldert was editor of the *Cotton Oil Press* and a personal friend of Herbert Hoover.

PERCY R. MEGGY of New South Wales is dead at 82. The *Standard* of Sydney gives a sketch of his life and his great services to the cause. He was indefatigable in his work for the movement and his article appeared in many periodicals. He was special correspondent of LAND AND FREEDOM for Australia. A newspaper man all his life he helped to found the *Chicago Daily News* during his stay in the United States and later was on the staff of the *London Echo*. He did much work for the Australian papers. The *Standard* tells us that his end was peaceful. A long and useful life is closed. Three daughters and a son survive him. Two sons were killed in the World War.

AN article in *Harpers* for August by Wayne W. Parish and Harold F. Clark, contains the following: "It is quite true that the quantity of land is fixed, but this is no longer suitable as a basis for economic theory. Production in the future will have little relation whatever to land itself." Comment is superfluous.

OUR old friend Rev. John F. Scott now resides at 1101 Atchison Street, Pasadena, Calif. He writes that he has been "crashing into the papers of late." He was present at a reception given by Mr. and Mrs. Lee to Mrs. Anna George de Mille within a few miles of his home. Mr. Scott writes in a letter full of his old humor. "I enjoyed it—all of which I saw and part of which I was."

L. C. PAINTER is a candidate for State Senator from Alexandria, Va. We quote from his platform:

Democracy is impossible with a vicious system of taxation. To restore prosperity; lower assessments against the farmer, merchant, mechanic, businessman, home owner, and raise them upon the valuable, idle, city and suburban land, and valuable merchandising land until they equal its rental value. Charging this valuable land full value for services rendered, would prevent land speculation, untax industry, and remove its shackles. Both would encourage industry. Virginia can break this depression immediately by adopting such a system. Every other State would have to follow suit to prevent their capital and labor from moving into Virginia.

THE death of Mrs. Isabel deForest Colbron at an advanced age announced. She was the mother of Grace Isabel Colbron and died at New Canaan, which had been her home for a number of years.

WE regret to chronicle the death of Mrs. Julia Goldzier in an automobile accident. She will be remembered as the author of the "At-one-ment of Single Tax and Christian Science." She knew her economics as well as she knew her Christian Science, though she had her differences with Mrs. Eddy.

EDWIN J. JONES of Westfield, N. J. writes:

The Single Taxer fully grounded in the faith has nothing but scorn and disgust for the corrupting and demoralizing methods of propaganda now being so mercilessly exposed in investigations at Washington. This crafty manner of warping the judgment of the citizen taxpayer and voter never can succeed because such is the power of truth that once the light of day is brought to bear upon the propagandists the exposure brings their work to naught. There is, therefore, no excuse for George adherents for deciding on the adoption of any but the strictest adherence to the truth as they have absorbed it from Henry George.

OUR old friend Frank G. Anderson has a Single Tax article of a column in *Skandia*, Swedish newspaper of Jamestown, N. Y. Brother Anderson was 78 on Oct. 5 and has been active in the movement since 1886.

MORRIS VAN VEEN of this city recently bought in a second hand bookstore a copy of "Progress and Poverty" (Appleton edition, 1882.) In it is a book plate of Frederick Leveson Gower, and neatly added in the book are numbered columns from the *London Times* of the excellent review of "Progress and Poverty" which appeared in the "Thunderer" of Sept. 14, 1882. Now is it a matter of record, and do any of our English friends know, if Mr. Gower was the author of that review so admirably done?

WE regret that in the review of Jorgensen's "Stagnation of Industry" in July-August LAND AND FREEDOM from the pen of Norman B. Fowles the name of the publisher was omitted. The work is issued from the publishing house of James Bell Company, Elkhart, Ind., and its price is \$2.00.

A RECENT visitor to this office was Father J. H. Higgins of Wellington, New Zealand, a convinced Henry George man and a charming personality. He will see Father Coughlin while here. He is now on his way to Washington, D. C. On his return he will get in touch with representatives of the movement here.

DR. ROYAL S. HAYES of Waterbury, Conn., sent a copy of "Progress and Poverty" to a friend, Dr. Dayton R. Pulford, of Toledo, who wrote Dr. Hayes as follows:

George appeals to me, for he goes to fundamentals and then builds, and does it step by step. He makes his premises so obvious and unalterable that one cannot help being impressed by their truth. He is so unlike the windy economists that clutter up the press. One thing, thank God, he does not decorate his book with charts and graphs. I always think of Roger Babson with his goatee and charts when I think of economics. Most of those damned economists have an axe to grind and hide their whetstone behind a gas barrage. I cannot help too about thinking of that Yale economist who thought prohibition was pulling us out of the depths of poverty and then we had to vote back liquor to get us out again.

FOXHALL A. PARKER of Salisbury, Md., has just returned from the international Lions' convention in Mexico City. An address was delivered by Lic Emilio Portes Gill, president of the National Political Party, and former president of Mexico, in which he advocated a policy of land restoration for Mexico. Mr. Parker asked him through an interpreter if he was familiar with the teachings of Henry George and he told him that he was not only familiar with them but very much interested. Mr. Parker also met and interviewed Senator Lic Moises Huerta and Mr. Richard Pesquera of Mexico City.

AN admirable letter which we have not the space to reprint appears in the Philadelphia *Evening Ledger* from the pen of Harold Sudell. We will send a hundred copies of this letter with a copy of the "Single Tax, What It Is and Why We Urge It" by Henry George, to as many persons as may be interested.

JAMES W. GERARD, former Minister to Germany, advocates a tax on spending abroad. We suggest that such a measure should be entitled, "A Bill to Reduce Employment at Sea, from Captain to Toker."

THE *Wilmington News* as well as *Every Evening* of the same city contained detailed reports of the celebration at Arden, Del., in August. The latter contained an excellent article from its special writer William P. Frank, in which is an interesting story of the Delaware campaign.

HON. HUGH PATERSON, member of Congress from the first Georgia

district, writes as follows to E. B. Gaston of the *Fairhope Courier*: "I am especially interested to get your views regarding the Single Tax. I have studied the Single Tax rather thoroughly and I am heartily in accord with the economic theories of Henry George." Page Howell Clopton Harris of Cordele, Ga.

WE regret to announce the death of Judge R. B. Minor of San Antonio, Texas, long an advocate of the Henry George philosophy and for many years a friend of LAND AND FREEDOM.

THE *New York Sun* has been very generous of late in its publication of Single Tax letters. These have included communications from John Luxton, Edwin J. Jones, Raymond V. McNally and others.

EUGENE W. WAY, of Seattle, Wash., suggests the reprinting in pamphlet form of Rabbi Aaronsohn's admirable address before the 37th Division of the A. E. F. He offers to take one hundred copies. If contributions are available we will undertake it.

COLONEL WILLIAM C. HARLLEE, who retired from the Marine Corps on July 1, after 35 years of service, announces that he will be a candidate for the United States Senate from South Carolina in the 1936 primaries. Col. Harlee is well known to the friends of the Henry George movement and is a fundamental Democrat. In a statement published in the Dillon, (S. C.) *Herald*, he says: "I am a Democrat devoted to the pioneer leaders of American democracy who proclaimed the majesty of all men and that the best government is the kind which governs least. Prosperity is not coming to this country by levying sales, excises or nuisance taxes, and borrowing money from bankers and paying them a tribute in interest and then squandering it all in priming the pump of business \* \* \* or handing it over to the shipping or other interests." The statement of Col. Harlee is published also in the Columbus, (S. C.) *State* and furnishes an admirable declaration of principles for his campaign. In a letter to the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM he says: "This State still clings to the democracy of Jefferson. The tide has turned against the New Dealers who seek to destroy the principles for which our people have struggled. I shall follow the kind of democracy we believe in and shall be guided by the beacon lights that mark the course." Col. Harlee thinks the prospects are encouraging.

Two statements appear in a recent issue of the *Nation*. One is as follows: "Proponents of the abolition of capital punishment sometimes seem as tiresome as Single Taxers." On another page of the same issue the *Nation* says: "The idiocy of poverty in the midst of plenty has often been pointed out." Our friend E. W. Doty of Cleveland writes to the *Nation*: "Do these two sentences by any chance emanate from the same writer. And just when did the *Nation* offer any remedy for idiocy of poverty, except Socialism, trades unionism, Wagner bills, and Section 7 a?"

THE Revere (Mass.) *Journal* of July 11 contained an article by Leslie Eichel, Times Central Press Staff Writer, dated at New York, headed "Single Taxers Attack F. D. R. Tax Proposals." W. L. Crosman of Revere augmented this with a letter in the next issue of the *Journal*. We may say that Mr. Eichel's syndicated letter appeared in a number of papers. He is doing good work for us.

FLORENCE GARVIN writes: "I am glad to see in the current issue of LAND AND FREEDOM that the New York Constitution, Article I, Section 10, states that the people in their right of sovereignty are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State." This would enable the State to commandeer all lands without compensation to the owners. My father, Governor Garvin of Rhode Island, was accustomed to ask if the government compensated the heirs who would compensate the disinherited?"

# Brotherhood of the Commonwealth

FOUNDED BY

Charles Frederic Adams

INTIMATE FRIEND OF HENRY GEORGE

Membership includes a tontine plan of  
old age insurance which is unique.

*Literature Furnished on Application*

ADDRESS

**LAND & FREEDOM**

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK CITY

---

## MR. FREDERICK VERINDER'S NEW WORK "LAND AND FREEDOM"

*Fourteen Chapters:* "The Mother of All Things;" The Value of Land; Monopolies; Landlord and Capitalist; Taxation; Some Inadequate Remedies; "Land Nationalization;" Disemployment; "Our Heritage the Slums;" Agricultural Land; The Burden of the Rates; Some Objections Considered; A New Doomsday Book; Economic Freedom and Social Justice.

*Appendix* (by A. W. Madsen): Land Value  
Taxation in Practice

Bound in Green Cloth, 208 pages. A mine of information for the writer, the speaker and the student.

**PRICE 75 CENTS**

Published by the Hogarth Press, 52 Tavistock Square, London, W.C. 1. Available at all bookshops on and after the publishing date. Advance orders may be sent to the

Henry George Foundation  
94 PETTY FRANCE, LONDON, S.W. 1

or to

The English League  
7 ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, LONDON, W.C. 2

IT'S EASY FOR YOU TO

# Start a Class

IN

## "Progress and Poverty" Later, Build a School

That's the sure-fire way to help. You learn your economics by studying this great book. Help others get the truth in the same way. Get some of your friends—three, six or a dozen—to agree to read regularly assigned portions of the book, and to meet once a week at your home or office to discuss what they have read. You can direct the discussion easily and properly with a

## Teacher's Manual

This valuable book was compiled by the late Oscar H. Geiger in his work of teaching "Progress and Poverty." It is the result of years of painstaking study—also of practical application to class room work. With this Manual—containing 263 questions and answers, suggestions on how to conduct discussion, regular reading assignments, illustrative charts—you can easily conduct your class through the eight lessons to a complete understanding of the message of Henry George. You will enjoy it and you will be doing something real in advancing the cause. Your friends will appreciate the knowledge.

**The Price--\$1.00**

Organize your group—send for your **Now**  
Manual and start spreading the light

As long as they last these Manuals will be  
supplied by the

**Henry George School  
of Social Science**  
Extension Course Department

211 West 79th Street

New York

November—December, 1935

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

## What to Emphasize in Teaching Henry George

Benjamin W. Berger at Henry George Congress

## The Story of Tax Relief for Land

Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown

## Where the Wealth Goes

Henry W. Hardinge

Reviews of Albert J. Nock's "Our Enemy the State"  
and Col. Rule's "Chaining the War God"

By Harry Weinberger and Frank Chodorov

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

# LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax progress  
Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 302 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico,  
\$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club sub-  
scriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office,  
New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

## NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1935

VOL. XXXV

No. 6 WHOLE No. 193

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,  
Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	179
THE SINGLE TAX (Concluded).....Henry George	181
WHAT TO EMPHASIZE IN TEACHING HENRY GEORGE .....Benjamin W. Burger	184
ADDRESS OF CHARLES O'CONNOR HENNESSY AT THE HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS.....	188
KEYNOTE CONVENTION SPEECH OF 1940 (Concluded) .....Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown	191
ACROSS THE COUNTRY WITH JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.....	196
EXTENSION CLASSES OF THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL	197
REPORT OF ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION .....Antoinette Kaufmann	198
BEGINNING OF THE HENRY GEORGE FELLOWSHIP .....Helen D. Denbigh	199
ARTHUR MADSEN AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS....	200
TRIBUTES TO HENRY GEORGE FROM HALL OF FAME ELECTORS.....	201
WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.....	202
WHERE THE WEALTH GOES.....Henry H. Hardinge	203
BOOK REVIEWS.....	204
CORRESPONDENCE.....	206
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	209

## WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.



# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXV

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1935

No. 6

## Comment and Reflection

THESE has long been a suspicion among a large portion of the public that there is little essential difference between the Republican and Democratic parties. It is doubtful if the Roosevelt policies have materially altered the relationship, at least to the point of providing any marked contrast. From many of the eminent figures of the Republican party have come condemnation more or less qualified. The N R A and the A A A have been adversely criticized, but we miss any very clear distinction between the policies of the two parties on matters of principle. Any clear cut division seems still to be lacking.

OF course the absence of a substitute policy, or a principle, that would answer uneasy inquiry and supplant the prevailing policy of the Washington administration, is the explanation of the futility of the opposition and the assurance of Republican defeat in 1936. The Republicans can only hope to win by a forthright presentation of a substitute philosophy of government for the prevailing one. It is not enough to hack at the edges of the strange edifice while conceding the validity of its foundations and the theories of its architects. Something more than that is required of the adversary.

DISRAELI'S famous aphorism that "It is the function of an opposition to oppose," is not all the story. No purely negative criticism is sufficient to win victory in a far-flung election. Here is the strength of the Roosevelt policies, namely the weakness of the opposition. It may safely be depended upon to win the election for him in 1936. It may be said that the differences that divide the parties are those of degree rather than kind. For against the "planned economy" of the administration the Republicans offer no alternative save to let things drift.

THE Democratic party has embarked on a strange and unexplored sea. But if it does not know its destination its sails are set and it appears to be going somewhere. There is a great fanfare on deck and even some cheering in the hold. They may be drifting on the rocks. But the opposition, on the other hand, has no destination of its own and knows not the whereabouts of the lighthouse.

LET us abandon this crude metaphor for the moment. The Republican party is bankrupt; the Democratic party is not bankrupt so long as it can circulate its spurious coins and get people to take them. And people will take them. Do not make any mistake about that, and do not imagine that the basest kind of political coins will not be preferred to none at all. If the Democratic coins are counterfeit, as we believe they are, they will pass current for quite a while, long enough at least to fool an ill-informed electorate.

LET us imagine the New Deal edifice as utterly demolished. Not one stone remains upon another—the space is cleared for the erection of a new edifice. The Republican architects will not tell us what they propose to build on the site. It is not enough to call Roosevelt socialistic, or to point with alarm at his spending programme. That is alarming enough in all truth but it is at least a programme, if an insane one, and people are not afraid of names. Half of the people cannot tell you what socialism is, not even the Socialists themselves.

NOR are the people afraid of insanity. A large portion of the people are insane upon matters of which they know nothing, and these include economics and government. When and if twelve million people sign petitions for the Townsend Plan (so runs the estimate, true or false) the milder insanity of the Roosevelt party will not lack millions of adherents. And if there should be temporary return of prosperity Roosevelt will get the credit for it and will be triumphantly elected. There will be enough people insane or uniformed to accomplish that.

THE issue on which the two parties may be expected to divide in 1936 is the new system by which it is proposed to supplant the American system of constitutional government which has had the sanction of the American people for one hundred and fifty years. That might seem sufficient to create a real division of American sentiment. But it seems to connote a strange partnership. Jeffersonian democracy and Republican protectionism do not readily mix, and as yet the Republican party shows no disposition to attack the Rooseveltian policies on fundamental differences—in other words, it

does not confront the administration with any policy that assures coalescence.

**T**HE hopelessness of any rational "line up" is evidenced in the confusion which prevails in the Republican opposition. Mr. Frank Knox, proprietor of the *Chicago Daily News*, who is spoken of as a possible candidate against the administration, is an economically ill-informed gentleman who would supplant the AAA with prohibitive tariffs and export bounties! And with these discarded weapons—discarded by every well equipped student of economics—it is proposed to advance against the well-drilled forces of the administration armed, politically at least, with every advantage of position and securely entrenched in power. It looks like a hopeless struggle.

**A**ND there is something else to be considered. Hungry men are not to be attracted by policies which, good or bad, do not touch them directly. Roosevelt has nearly all the promises, and a little turn in prosperity will do the trick for them. He said over the radio the other day: "We have turned the corner. This is not mere chance nor the ending of a cycle. We planned it." (We quote now from memory.) Already he is claiming it. If it even temporarily succeeds, Mr. Knox's plan for prohibitive tariffs and export bounties have small chance of attracting the voter. The cry will then be to let well enough alone.

**T**HERE is as much economic ignorance in one party as in the other. You cannot fight ignorance with ignorance; you can only fight ignorance with knowledge. There is little to choose between Hoover and Roosevelt and less between Knox and Roosevelt. If this is to be the division the election of Roosevelt is assured. His bag of promises is still not exhausted and in the prevailing state of ignorance a slight turn in prosperity, though with the inevitable depression awaiting at the end, the cry of "We planned it" will be enough.

**T**HE way to meet restrictions is not with further restriction. The appeal is to liberty. And the signs of reassurance as to the coming of liberty, though not visible in the political horizon, are gratifyingly plentiful among intellectuals everywhere. In the flood of books now taxing the time of those who read at all, Henry George is coming into his own. The times are ours. Slowly but surely we are breaking through. One of the keenest observers of the modern trend is Leslie Eichel, columnist for several hundred papers, who said recently: "As the New Deal staggers on, unsuccessful in its attempts to re-employ men, and as critics assault it with nothing to offer in its stead, the Henry George group of economists slowly push forward."

**T**HERE is something vividly impressive in this march of a great idea, something that not only stirs a confidence in its early triumph, but a faith that is profound and deeper still. That is a faith in the orderly processes of the natural law in society. The cry of "God will it" heard in the old Anti Poverty days may be heard again. God has not forgotten his children. And if this movement set in motion by Henry George is now in its second stage it is none the less divinely ordered and in harmony with the law of justice which is the law of God. It will not be sensed by every one, even by many who accept the philosophy, but to others it will be clear that we are preparing the way for a civilization greater and more glorious than any of which we dream.

**D**O we claim too much for what appears to some as a mere change in taxation? If it were only that it would in truth be that we claim too much. But it is not that—not that alone surely. It was Goethe who said that the highest cannot be spoken in words. Truth is revealed in vision and to the eyes of the spirit. Imagine a world where there is no poverty, no wars, no national jealousies, only a world made free and intensely emulative. We may then be on the threshold of solution to other problems which we have little time to consider, too harassed to pause, too far removed from the experiences of the soul which are in the nature of divine intimations known but to the strangely gifted. The human race is not only the heir of all the ages, but is the inheritor of the future whose revelations, as the wise Goethe has told us, cannot be spoken in words, but are reserved only for a race made materially and spiritually free.

**T**O descend a moment but proceeding along what after all is the same line of thought, do we ever stop to think that the new world made possible by the far reaching change for which we contend will render obsolete much of the world's twisted morals, the eccentricities of many religious faiths, and also a great deal of the world's literature, some of its poetry, and great tomes of its philosophies?

**S**OME of the followers of Henry George will feel a keen sense of disappointment that our distinguished leader has failed of election to the Hall of Fame. This disappointment we cannot share. It took some time for Edgar Allan Poe, the most distinctive of American poets to crash the gates of the Hall of Fame, perhaps because he was fond of whiskey and needed very little to render him either inspired or helpless. We are reminded of Abraham Lincoln's answer to complaints that General Grant drank heavily. He said, as our readers will recall that he would like to know the brand of whiskey Grant favored that he might recommend it to others of his

generals. In the same way the kind of whiskey indulged by Poe might be recommended to some of the so-called poets who clutter the magazines with their almost incomprehensible verse.

THIS merely by way of digression. Sixty-one votes were required to elect. Henry George received fifty-six, or five less than needed. A short fifty years have elapsed since Henry George was denounced by the "saviors of society" and the conservative element everywhere as an anarchist and a dangerous enemy of the Commonwealth. Much water has passed under the bridge since then. Fifty-six out of one hundred and one eminent educators, authors, scientists, and public men representing every State in the Union, have signified their desire that this once despised printer and "agitator" be enshrined among the immortals. This is a great advance the world moves. His defeat by so narrow a margin, a victory for human intelligence and five years from now there will be another election. In the meantime his name is secure and growing.

## The Single Tax\*

By HENRY GEORGE

(Concluded)

TO give an illustration, let us suppose that a man of great wealth and benevolence, wishing to help a number of poor people, erects a building of many apartments. He stores the cellars with coal; he secures a supply of water; and he so adapts the building that elevators may be put in, and heat, light and water, and power be conducted through it. He does not wish to become a special providence to these men, for that would be to make and keep them babies. He wishes them, by doing for themselves, to develop manly qualities and to learn to live together. So admitting a certain number to the building, and providing for the future coming of others, he leaves them at liberty to manage as they please. The donor of the building asks no revenue; he has made a free gift. But the tenants will need a revenue, since some of them must be occupied in taking care of the house, making improvements from time to time, and in doing other things for the common benefit.

Now, the proper way of raising this revenue will be clear—so clear that it will be certain to whoever considers it that the donor could have intended no other. And this way will appear as soon as the tenants come to settle the occupancy among themselves. Though for a day or two after they enter into possession they may

treat the house as common, yet they will soon discover the necessity for definite location. The question of how the apartments shall be assigned among them will thus come up. If all the apartments were alike, and if the matter of location with respect to other tenants made no difference, equality might be assured by letting each take an apartment leaving the unoccupied ones for newcomers. But the apartments are not all alike, and location in respect to other occupants is a matter of importance, especially since the erection of elevators, the distribution of heat, power, electricity, etc., could not be made all at once, but would come first in the best-tenanted parts of the house. The most desirable apartments would therefore command premiums. To collect these premiums for the common expenses would be the obvious way both to put all the tenants on a level with regard to the bounty of their benefactor and to provide for common needs and improvements. Under this system there would be no levy on any individual. There would be only a single tax, collected from the occupants of the more desirable rooms. No one would be taxed for living in the building or for having an apartment, for every one would be free without the payment of any premium, to take any apartment that no one else wanted. It would be only to the use of rooms of more than ordinary desirability that the payment of a premium would be a condition.

In this way as the new tenants came in, in accordance with the benefactor's will, they would, until the house was really full, find ample room on equal terms with those already there, and in this way all the common expenses and the costs of making improvements could be met. As the tenants increased in number and improvements were made, the relative desirability of the apartments might change. Some that at first were most desirable and paid the highest premiums might become of only ordinary desirability and cease to bring any premium while the upper stories, that at first no one cared to live in, might, when the elevators got running, seem most desirable and pay the highest premiums. But the aggregate premiums would increase with increase of numbers and the making of improvements, and a larger and larger common fund be available for common purposes.

Now this is the way of the Single Tax—the method which we Single Tax men would apply to that house of which we are all tenants.

But another way MIGHT be adopted. If such tenants were to do as we of the United States have done, they would let a few of their number claim the apartments as their private property, collect the premiums, and keep the greater part of them. They would let them claim whole blocks of as yet unoccupied apartments, and in the effort to get monopoly and speculative premiums hold them vacant long after those who ought to use them had arrived, compelling the new-comers to go farther upstairs or into the wings, or to sleep in passage-ways, and to wander around unable to find a place to work. They

\*NOTE:—This article, written by Henry George, and published in *The Century*, July, 1890, in answer to the attack, written by Edward Atkinson, entitled "A Single Tax on Land" in the same issue of the magazine, is here reproduced and slightly abridged by Anna George Mille.

would let other grabbers go into the cellars and claim the store of coal as their private property. They would let others claim the water supply, and others take the privilege of putting up the elevators, etc., and charging tolls. And then to supply the place of the proper revenue thus given away they would station guards at each entrance to the building to seize part of everything brought in, and send men nosing about the apartments demanding of each tenant to exhibit all he had, that they might levy toll on it. What liars and perjurers and evaders this system would make; how it would prevent proper improvement, and discourage honest work, and stimulate everything mean and wicked; how it would frustrate the benevolent intention of the builder of the house; how many of the tenants would be miserably poor, while a few could be lavish and lazy. This is our present economic system.

The value of land in cities is higher relative to the value of improvements than in farming districts. Hence it is clear that to abolish all taxes, save a tax on land values, would be to the gain of the farming districts. In such case there is but little real land value, and under the Single Tax such farmers would pay but a small tax. But under the present system they are taxed most heavily. There are taxes on their buildings, their improvements their stock, their furniture, their crops, and in many of our States on their very mortgages—for the tax levied on the mortgagee the mortgagor must pay. Taxes compel them to wear shoddy when they might wear wool, to sleep under quilts and comfortables when they might have blankets, to pay for three bushels of salt or two lumps of sugar in order to get one. From the plow that turns the ground to the machine with which he harvests the crop and the steel rails that carries it to market, from the lumber and nails of his house to the hat on his head, almost everything the farmer uses is increased in cost by taxes that fatten rings, combinations and favored individuals. The American farmer, like Issachar, is a strong ass; but today he is crouching, with almost broken back between two burdens—the burden of land speculation, which makes him pay for land he ought to get for nothing, and the burden of taxation, which wherever else it may not stay put, does stay put when it reaches him. Between the two he is being crushed out. All through the United States the typical American farmer is disappearing, and the tenant, or "blanket man," is taking his place, or the land is relapsing to wilderness.

Those methods of plucking the goose without making it cry, such as indirect taxation, have always proved curses. Without them the wars, the standing armies, the enormous public debts of our modern world would have been impossible. Out of them has come that doctrine of protection that negatives the benefits of invention by raising in hostile tariffs greater obstacles to human intercourse than seas and mountains; that legalizes robbery and

makes piracy pass for patriotism; that teaches so-called Christian people that "they didn't know everything down in Judee," and that the interests of men are not mutual but antagonistic. It is this taxation that maintains the standing armies that prop European thrones with bayonets, and that has made our republic rotter with corruption.

Look at the willful extravagance this system has caused in the United States. Our Federal taxation is kept up for the sake of monopoly. Every proposition of waste has the powerful support of interests that want taxes imposed or maintained to enable them to rob their fellow countrymen; interests whose impudence and pertinacity have actually made many Americans believe that they can get rich by taxing themselves—that the way to help the laborer is to pile burdens on his back. But for this system of indirect taxation we might since the war have paid off every penny of the national debt, and had today nothing but a nominal Federal revenue to raise.

The Single Tax would destroy this vicious system. It would end the pressure to impose and maintain taxes and would enable us to dismiss a horde of officials and bring the Federal Government to its proper simplicity.

The tax on land values would be collected just as it is now, and where improved land was sold for taxes, which would be seldom or never the case, an adjustment could readily be made which would secure the value (not cost) of the improvements to the owner. Land would be more readily improved than now, since it could be had for improvement on easier terms, and the whole value of the improvement would be left to the improver. As the tax was increased speculative or anticipatory values would rapidly disappear, while selling values would diminish and if the tax were pushed to theoretical perfection they would also disappear. But rental or use values would remain. It does not lessen the value of land to the user if what he must pay to the owner is taken from that owner in taxation. If we ever reach the point of theoretical perfection so nearly that selling values disappear, then we shall only have to abandon the American plan of assessing selling values and adopt the English plan of assessing rental or use values. With speculative values gone, and with public attention concentrated on one source of revenue, there could be no difficulty in this.

To reach this point of theoretical perfection, at which land would have no selling value,—i.e., would yield to the mere owner no income,—would be to reach (what Mr. Atkinson himself confesses to be) the ideal. Then labor and capital could be applied to land without any artificial obstruction whatever. They would be free from all taxes on themselves or their products, while they would not have to buy land, but would only pay for its use where peculiar advantages gave them a large return. Even before this point was reached mere owner

ship would cease. Men would not care to own land they did not want to use, and users of land, where their use was more than transient, would become the legal owners, having the assured privilege of peaceable possession and transfer as long as the tax was paid.

How close it might be possible finally to come to the point of theoretical perfection, or whether it would be best to leave such a margin as would give a small selling value, are matters which, like other questions of detail, it is not now necessary to discuss. But in thinking of details it should be remembered that we cannot get to the Single Tax at one leap, but only by gradual steps, which will bring experience to the settlement of details; and that from the abolition of present taxes, and the resulting ease in social conditions, we may expect moral improvements, which will make easier than might now seem possible the fair and full collection of a tax that looks for the use of the community only values due to the progress of the community. Taxes on the products of labor, taxes which take the earnings of industry and the savings of thrift, always have begotten, and always must beget, fraud, corruption, and evasion. All the penalties of the law—imprisonments, fines, torture, and death—have failed to secure their honest and equal collection. They are unjust and unequal in their very nature, always falling on the poor with greater severity than on the rich. Their collection always entails great waste and cost, increases the number of office holders and the complexity of government, and compels interference with individual affairs; always checks production, lessens general wealth, and takes from labor and capital their due reward—the stimulus to productive exertion. Men naturally evade and resist them, and with the sanction of the moral sense even where their duller intellectual faculties are convinced that such taxes are right and beneficial in themselves. There may be protectionists who will not smuggle or undervalue when they get a chance, but I have never met them. There may be rich men who make a true return of their wealth for taxation, but they are very few. Rent, however, is usually a willing payment. It is the strength of landlordism, so outrageously and preposterously unjust, that it appropriates a natural contribution or tax that in itself men recognize as just. For the privilege of occupying a superior location to that of others a man feels that he ought to pay. A while ago it was discovered that a man had been for years collecting rents on some blocks of land belonging to the city in the upper part of New York. Those who paid the rent had not inquired into his ownership. They knew, though perhaps they did not reason it out, that THEY were not entitled to use this superior land any more than other people, and were willing to pay for the advantage they got.

Is there any scarcity of capital? Why, everywhere there is a seeming surplus of labor. Even in what we have become accustomed to think normally good times there are men ready and anxious to labor who cannot

get the opportunity—masses of men wholly or partly unemployed who would gladly be at work. So much is labor in seeming excess of the opportunities to labor that from all parts of the country come requests for laborers to keep away; that we talk and think of work as a thing in itself to be desired and to be "made;" are beginning to keep convicts in idleness or at unproductive labor that honest men may have work; and to take the first steps in shutting out laborers who come from abroad.

With an abundance of capital, with a surplus of labor, —the thing that makes capital,—with a people anxious for more wealth, why is not more wealth produced? Is there any scarcity of land? To ask the question is to answer it. In this country there are as yet but (sixty-five millions\*) of us scattered over a territory that even in the present stage of the arts could support a thousand millions! Any scarcity of land? Go where you will, even in our cities, and you may see unsued land and half-used land—natural opportunities lying idle while labor presses for employment and capital wastes.

What is the cause? Simply that instead of applying economic rent to the purpose for which in the natural order it was intended, we leave it to be a premium and incentive to forestalling and monopoly, while we tax industry. There is no real scarcity of land, but there is an artificial scarcity that has the same effect. Our land is not all in use—we have hardly more than begun to scratch it; but it is practically all fenced in. Wherever labor and capital go to find employment on land they find the speculator ahead of them, demanding a rent or price based not on present development, but on the prospects of future development.

To end all this, to open to labor and capital opportunities of employment bounded only by the desires of men, we have but to conform to the manifest intent of the Builder of the house, to abolish unnatural taxes, and to resort to their natural source for public revenues. On the one hand we would do away with all taxes that now stifle industry and thrift, and would give free play to the human factor of production. On the other hand we would break up the monopolization of the natural factor. When economic rent was taken for public use the mere ownership of land would become as profitless as it is sterile. No one would want to own land unless he wanted to use it; and for all who wanted to use land there would be land enough and to spare. With the forces of production thus set free, with the natural and limitless means of production thus opened, who could set bounds to the production of wealth? Were invention and discovery to stop today the productive forces are strong enough to give to the humblest not merely all the necessities, but all the comforts and reasonable luxuries of life with but a moderate amount of labor—to destroy utterly the nightmare of want.

What is poverty?

---

\*Now in 1935 one hundred and twenty million.

Is it not the want of the things that work produces on the part of those willing to do reasonable work. Why is there such want?

I need not point out that while a few of our people have more wealth than is wholesome for men to have,—for great fortunes have been growing here faster than ever before in the world's history,—the masses of our people do not have wealth enough to give them the comforts, the leisure, and the opportunities of development that in this stage of civilization ought to be possible to the humblest; that most of us by working hard merely manage to live, and must stint and strain and worry; that many are becoming criminals, tramps, and paupers, and many are eking out an existence by charity in one form or another; that children die when they ought to live; that women are old and worn when they ought to be in their prime of womanly beauty and charm; that men are aged physically and stunted mentally and morally when they ought to be in the highest development of their faculties; that many who ought to have wives feel too poor to take them; that many who ought to have husbands are cheated out of the fullness of the life for which nature intended them. What a pitiful possibility does this represent for the average American citizen?

We want more wealth. Why, then, do we not produce more? What factor is short? Where is the limitation?

But instead of invention and discovery stopping, they would only have begun. What checks invention and discovery today is poverty; what turns the very blessings they ought to bring to all into curses to great masses is that fundamental wrong which produces that most unnatural and helpless of all objects, the mere laborer—the human being feeling all the wants of a man, having all the powers of a man, yet denied by human laws all access to or right in that element without which it is impossible for human powers to satisfy human wants. To what as yet undreamed-of powers over natural things man may rise, in a state of society where, the forces of production being unhampered and the natural opportunities for production being unmonopolized, there shall be work for all, leisure for all, opportunities of full development for all, the inventions and discoveries of the century just closing afford but hints.

The cause of poverty is not in human nature; it is not in the constitution of the physical world; it is not in the natural laws of social growth. It is in the injustice which denies to men their natural rights; in the stupidity which diverts from its proper use the value which attaches to land with social growth, and then imposes on industry and thrift taxes which restrain production and put premiums on greed and dishonesty; injustice and stupidity which ignores the true rights of property and turn governments into machines by which the unscrupulous may rob their neighbors.

## What to Emphasize in Teaching the Philosophy of Henry George

BENJAMIN W. BURGER OF NEW YORK CITY  
AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS

I HAVE often wondered why a reform, eminently just as ours, should be so long delayed in finding common acceptance. Looking back over the pages of history at other great reforms, now happily accomplished, the mystery becomes more understandable.

Chattel slavery, the ownership of one human being by another, was abolished in this country a short seventy years ago. As we look back, we wonder how anyone could have justified slavery. Yet we know that no only did it have stout defenders, particularly in the South but men of the cloth quoted Scripture to justify it. Four years' bloody war was necessary to end it in the United States; it has not yet been abolished throughout the world. In Ethiopia, Arabia, Liberia and Central Asia there are today 5,000,000 slaves.

Today we look back upon slavery as an obvious evil and wonder why a handful of delegates from the slave and free states, sitting around a table, could not amicably have arranged to abolish it without the terrible expense misery and suffering of prolonged warfare. Human slavery, we say, was an obvious evil. But no more obvious than the present industrial slavery which permits a small number, purporting to own the earth, (which is not a product of human labor and therefore cannot be owned) to rent it to us before we may live and work.

The obvious things in life escape us. The disenfranchisement of woman, another obvious evil, was abolished only after years of persistent agitation. What more obvious than that women are affected by the political, social, and economic conditions surrounding them, and therefore have an *inherent right* to participate in making laws? Yet it required one hundred years intensive agitation to secure this simple right. There are still millions of men, and women too, who look with disfavor upon woman suffrage. That women have not yet made the best use of their newly acquired right is beside the point. They have a right, an *inherent right*, with their brothers, fathers and husbands, to determine the conditions under which they live and work and raise their children. They had to fight long and hard to acquire that right. In the same way, we wonder how cannibalism, and other terrible practices of our hoary past could be defended. Yet we know there were those who justified them, every one; cannibalism, slavery, witchcraft, woman disenfranchisement, absolute monarchies and, in modern times, war, religious strife, race hatred, vaccination, capital punishment, misappropriation of land rent, and many other wrongs.

How can we explain this? Well, one answer is that

he obvious is not always obvious to those who live in the midst of the evil to be corrected; the obvious is not always obvious to those who participate in the evil, and are its immediate beneficiaries. Only a handful, fired with the divine faculty of imagination, conceive a world free from injustice, strife, suffering.

\* \* \*

Fate has ever been unkind to rebels against injustice. Most people, even if uncomfortable, object to being disturbed. They are victims of inertia. Their attitude, subconsciously, is, "if you ask me to work, I'll hate you; if you ask me to think, I'll kill you."

Our reform must contend with still another difficulty. It is a fundamental reform. It is truly radical in that it probes down to root causes. *We assert that those who labor shall receive the fruits of their labor.* We fear not to be called radicals. Anyone who knows his Latin knows that the word radical comes from the Latin *radix* meaning root. (A radish, for example, is a root vegetable.) What more rational way to correct an evil than to probe down to its root causes? For it is only as you abolish root causes that you truly cure.

Imagine a dentist trying to cure a toothache due to an infected root by polishing the crown, or filling the cavity, and ignoring the root condition. The great evolution in medicine during the past half century has been in the field of ascertaining and removing root causes of disease. The wise physician no longer prescribes pills for headaches or stomach-aches; or operations for internal disorders. He seeks to ascertain the *causes* of the headaches or disorders. By removing these causes he knows the effects will, in due time, disappear, provided, of course, there have been no organic changes.

In criminology, we have not yet learned this great truth. An economic system, under which we must surrender part of our wealth for mere permission to live and work on the earth is a system which deprives men and women of their *inherent right* to earn their daily bread and forces many into crime. Then the law condemns the victims instead of correcting the conditions which produce them. "The Law," said Charles Dickens, "is an ass."

We have then the indisputable fact that our reform is fundamental, and most people lack the patience and ability to think problems through to their basic causes. Palliation is quicker. Fundamental reform takes too long. (Curiously, while few can see the relationship between the misappropriation of our land rent and involuntary poverty, the first objection they hurl at us when we present our philosophy is, "How will your system abolish poverty?")

The inability of people to think the problem of political economy through from cause to effect explains the vogue of Socialism which expends itself in palliating the *effects* of poverty instead of ascertaining and abolishing *its*

*cause.* Socialists offer as plasters to ease the pains of poverty, caused by injustice, maternity insurance, old age pensions, workmen's compensation, state milk for babies, inheritance and income taxes, and nostrums to share wealth.

*To stop those who claim to own our earth from robbing both Labor and Capital is no essential part of the Socialist Platform.* They would rather treat fifty limbs of a tree than cure the diseased roots. Socialists fail to see that two factors produce wealth, while three factors divide it, AND THAT *if they stopped that basic wrong*, there would be no need for their little palliatives. That the Socialists do not recognize the fundamental importance of the land question will be readily apparent when we examine their platforms, city, state, and national. Some years they advocate the public appropriation of land rent; other years they ignore it. Their stock in trade is protestation, denunciation, and palliation.

\* \* \*

Essentially, we believe in freedom; freedom for the individual to express himself, limited only by the equal freedom of every other individual. The supreme value of mankind is the human individual, and the human individual can realize himself only in free and creative co-operation with his fellows. Only in a free society can men produce most efficiently, most abundantly, and express their noblest selves. Our viewpoint is that of Diogenes, who, when asked by Alexander what the King could do for him, proudly replied, "Only keep out of my sunlight."

Today, liberty has been surrendered by 500,000,000 people, to whom Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and other dictators falsely have promised economic security. "The love of liberty," wrote Hazlitt, "is the love of others; the love of power is the love of ourselves." We perceive that freedom must be a chimera where a few can charge the many rent for our common mother, the Earth. Now, the Socialists believe that government may become a good substitute for freedom. Let the Great Father at Washington, or Albany or at the New York City Hall mail us \$200 Townsend checks on the first of each and every month; or proffer us cash when we are unemployed, or arbitrarily fix prices for food, rent, and wages, say the Socialists. We believe these attempts to interfere with natural law must fail, and failing, must lead to coercion, because, basically, they are unsound.

The present government at Washington shares the Socialist's viewpoint. When Mrs. Roosevelt, an excellent woman, observes the West Virginia coal miners living amidst squalor and poverty and lacking the necessities of life, she says, "Let's transfer these unhappy people to more congenial surroundings. Let's send them to the country or ship them to Alaska." It never occurs to her whether they will be more successful in their new surroundings, nor why they have been unable to earn a

living in their old surroundings, which just as sadly cry out for development. It never dawns upon her that land values are going to arise in the new locations whence these people, like cattle, have been shipped, which will enable a few to rob industry of the biggest part of its wages. These land values are going to be a liability to the new settlers, and a first charge on their industry, and an asset only to those who, legally, may misappropriate them. *Mrs. Roosevelt never advocates abolishing the system under which a few, purporting to own the earth get something for nothing, with the result that producers get nothing for something. Mrs. Roosevelt never advocates the Georgian system under which, by collecting our publicly created land rent and applying it to our public needs, and abolishing taxation, we would, in effect, establish each and every human being's equal right to live on this earth without paying tribute to any landlord.*

"The rich will do everything for the poor," wrote Tolstoi, "except get off their backs."

\* \* \*

Like Boston, which has been called a state of mind, our philosophy can find acceptance only in a well ordered mind. It can be grasped only by those who love liberty for her own sake; who sense a Divine order in the Universe; who can understand fundamental principles in the realm of political economy; who are familiar with the history of government; who agree with Jefferson, that that government is best which governs least; who can reason from cause to effect.

Herbert Spencer truly said that it required a high type of human being to make democracy a success. Our philosophy can succeed only when there are men and women of fine feeling, possessing what educators call "a sense of awareness;" men and women who can distinguish between "mine and thine" on one hand, and "ours" on the other; *for we see things not as they are, but as we are.*

True to the character of his philosophy, Henry George was a deeply reverential being; considerate, kindly patient with those who differed with him; serene in adversity, at all times radiating sweetness and light.

Karl Marx, the founder of modern Socialism, was his antithesis. Marx was opposed to religion, calling it an opiate to keep the masses in poverty; (this is the slogan of his present day Russian disciples.) He was embittered, sour at humanity, intolerant of criticism, and preached the terrible doctrine of class hatred.

\* \* \*

To understand the Georgeist philosophy requires a new orientation, or new viewpoint. In ancient times, men built their temples so that the worshippers at the altar should face the rising sun. As the worshippers prayed, their faces were suffused with the sun's rays. The location of a structure thus to face the sun eventually came to be defined by the verb, "to orient." Hence

the noun "orientation" was developed as significant of articulation with, and adjustment to one's environment.

What do I mean when I say one must be properly orientated before one can grasp political economy? I mean he must understand its fundamentals: he must grasp his relationship to the globe on which he lives, and from which he draws his sustenance. *He must recognize that this globe lacks the characteristics of private property.*

Six qualities distinguish land from private property.

1. The earth on which we live was not produced by any human being, but is the gift of the Creator for the equal use of all his children.
2. It is limited in quantity.
3. It is essential to our existence, because we can produce nothing without it.
4. It does not owe its value to anything which land-owners choose to put on it.
5. It owes its value entirely to the presence and activities of the community.
6. It cannot be carried away or concealed.

These are, indeed, unique qualities.

*It is significant that no form of individually created wealth possesses a single one of these characteristics.*

\* \* \*

The position of mankind today with reference to political economy is analogous to that of the human race in the 15th century with reference to astronomy.

Until the discoveries of Copernicus, it was believed that our earth was the center of the universe; that the earth stood still while the heavenly bodies revolved around it. With the publication of Copernicus's work in 1543, man learned his *true position* in the universe. He discovered that the earth was only a tiny speck of dust in the universe; one of the many specks of dust traveling around the sun, which is over a million times as big as the earth, and is *itself* only a grain of sand in the vastness of space. It was not until man learned his true position in the universe that he was able to make real strides in the science of astronomy. Likewise, he will not be able to advance in the science of political economy until he has been properly orientated, that is, until he has acquired perspective.

What are the essential elements we must establish for the public collection and public expenditure of land rent? Since the problem is not unlike a problem in law, let us examine an analogy from that field. If, for example, A sues B for damages, claiming misrepresentation, A can recover only if he proves five essential points:

1. That B made certain representations to A, orally or in writing.
2. That these representations were statements of fact, not merely expressions of opinion.
3. That B made these representations to induce A to act upon them.



4. That, in fact, A did act upon them.
5. That A suffered damages as a result.

Unless A proves each and every one of these five points, his case fails.

Now, it happens that the points which we must prove to establish our case for the public appropriation of ground rent also are five in number.

First, it seems to me, we must convincingly show that we live on the earth; that out of that earth, labor must fashion its habitations, whether rude huts or the most magnificent palaces; on that earth, men must lovingly tend their animals, in order that they may have meat and drink, leather and wool; on that earth, labor must tickle the soil to grow fruits, vegetables and grains; over that earth man must operate trains, ships, and automobiles to transport themselves and their products; under the waters of that earth they must operate submarines, and in the air airplanes; on that earth, teachers, doctors, lawyers, preachers, newspapermen, actors, and a thousand other trades and professions must minister to the efficiency, comfort, mental and spiritual advancement of those who toil on the earth.

*In short, the first point we must convincingly establish, is that man, in his physical aspects, at least, is a land animal, chained to this ball called the earth, his activities limited to the earth, at death, the elements constituting his body again returning to earth.*

"Dust thou art, to dust returnest."

You say this is obvious?

Speak to the first ten men you meet, and learn with astonishment how many consider land no longer essential to their existence; indeed they are uncertain that their needs must be satisfied from land. They fail to perceive that employment requires use of land.

"We don't need land any more," they will tell you, "we live in cities, in six-story buildings."

\* \* \*

"Why, you can get all the land you want for nothing, out West," they tell you.

Socialists, Technocrats and Communists glibly speak of machines "manufacturing clothing and shoes," and becoming so efficient that "human labor soon will become unnecessary." (Of course, no machine ever produced anything. All a machine does is to aid labor, transform raw material taken out of the earth, into shapes, forms, colors, and conditions suitable for human needs.) It comes as a distinct surprise to Socialists that every brick, column, piece of stone, bit of glass composing a building was fashioned by labor from materials extracted from the earth; that every bit of food which we eat is nothing but land that has been transformed by the alchemy of nature into a condition suitable for human consumption, and that every job requires access to land. No one can clearly perceive our philosophy unless and until he recognizes his utter dependency on the planet to which he is

chained, and from which, by his labor, every moment, he draws his food and bodily covering, and has his being.

In Brooklyn, a few years ago, the Socialists seriously informed me that machinery and factories now were more important than land. If they lived on the ground, in tents, they might agree that land was essential; living instead in six-story tenements, they are not quite certain they use the earth. It signifies little to them that the tenements rest on ground.

Likewise, if every morning, chicken-like, they had to go out and scratch the ground for their food, they would clearly see that all food is produced by labor applied to earth; using bottled milk and can openers, they have a hazy notion it somehow comes from dairies and factories.

We place the emphasis on the essential, land; they place the emphasis on the non-essential, capital. Henry George rightly said that the trouble with Socialism was that it was not radical; it failed to reach down to root causes.

The *second point* we must establish is that all human beings have an equal right to live on this earth, or, as the Declaration of Independence phrases it, "an unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Since the American and French revolutions, this point has not been so hotly disputed, although there are still many who practise the contrary. Witness our discriminations against our black brothers; discrimination against Jews, and Catholics; lynchings, race riots, Ku Klux Klans, Russian pogroms, German anti-Semitism.

The basis for the assertion of human equality is that every human being, *because he is a human being*, has indefeasible worth, and therefore is entitled to honor and respect. True, a human being may fail to exhibit his wonderful qualities; he may, in fact, express his worst side, but, *potentially*, we recognize in every human being divine qualities which we are to elicit, for, as *we elicit them in others, we thereby release these divine possibilities within ourselves*. This point has been especially developed by religion and ethics.

(To recapitulate: First we must prove that the earth is indispensable for man's existence. Secondly, that all men have an equal right to live on the earth.)

The *third point*, a corollary, flows from these two points; namely, the earth cannot be privately owned, any more than the air or the sunshine, or the flowing rivers, or the mighty mountains, and each generation has only a right to use the earth, and cannot foreclose succeeding generations from their equal right to use it.

The *fourth point*, that land rent, a differential, measures the desirability of different locations, presents a problem of inductive reasoning, in the science of political economy.

The *fifth point*, in my opinion the most difficult to establish to the satisfaction of beginners, is this: By using ground rent for our common needs, and abolishing taxation, we, in effect, establish each and every human being's equal right to live.

*When, and only when, we have satisfactorily established each and every one of these five points, have we proved our case.*

\* \* \*

Long before Henry George, thousands of years ago, in fact, wise philosophers, great religious teachers, and deep thinkers in the realm of political economy had perceived that our earth, because of its unique nature, could not be private property, like buildings, suits of clothes, or food, which labor produces.

Henry George's contribution to the solution of the age-old problem of want in the midst of plenty, consisted of this:

He showed how, by applying land rent for our common needs, and abolishing taxation, we, in effect, established the inherent right of every human being to live equally with every other human being. Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, among others, had missed this vital point.

I have already indicated the importance of a sound understanding of fundamental politico-economic principles. It requires a thorough comprehension of wealth, how it is produced, and how it is distributed, to grasp the philosophy of Henry George. Especially, it requires a clear conception of the definitions of the terms of political economy; land, labor, capital, interest, wages, rent. Henry George devoted one chapter of twenty-six pages in "Progress and Poverty" to defining the terms he was about to use, before setting out to solve the problem of the unjust distribution of wealth. Geometry, which like political economy, is an exact science, first defines the terms to be employed and sets forth its axioms and postulates before offering its problems for solution.

How can we explain our philosophy to the Socialists, for example, who include land monopoly in the term, "capital;" or to the man in the street, to whom, "landlord" signifies only the individual who owns the building in which he lives, who in many cases, has leased the ground, and is not a *land* owner; or the term rent, which to the man in the street, connotes the payment he will be called upon to make on the first of next month, solely, he believes, for the three-room apartment he occupies? He has never paused to think that land has a value separate, and distinct, and apart from the improvements in, on, or above it.

Or the terms, wealth and property, in which most persons include also land; or the term real estate, which includes two such diverse elements as land, placed here by the Creator, and improvements on land, produced by the labor of human beings? Or the term profits, which as commonly used, may signify wages, interest, rent, any two, or all three? Ask the next person who talks about, "production without profit," which of these he has in mind.

It is of vital importance then, if we would be under-

stood, that the terms of political economy mean exactly the same to our listeners as they mean to us. How far would I get, in solving a problem in geometry for you, if you understood a triangle to be a four-sided figure? Or, suppose I, speaking only English, tried to convey a thought to you, speaking only Spanish, how far would I get? The story of an American in Spain, in this situation, is pertinent. Being very thirsty, after a hot summer's day's journey on foot, the American sought a glass of milk; unable to make known his wants in the vernacular, he drew on the bill of fare the picture of a cow. Within two minutes, the Spanish waiter returned with tickets for a bull fight. (Incidentally, this bears out what I have previously said, about seeing things, not as they are, but as *we are*.)

\* \* \*

Believing that Henry George correctly formulated the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth, the HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE has been chartered, under the Laws of the State of New York, to teach the science of political economy. We confidently believe that the student who familiarizes himself with the simple laws of that science, cannot help become an advocate of the Georgeian philosophy.

"Correct thought," wrote Henry George, "must precede right action. Where there is correct thought, right action will follow."

## Address of Charles O'Connor Hennesy

PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION  
FOR FREE TRADE AND LAND VALUE  
TAXATION

HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS, SEPTEMBER 27

**I**T seems to me very fitting that a gathering of the professed followers of Henry George, wherever held should devote some part of its proceedings to the international aspect of Henry George's philosophy.

This is particularly true at this time, when, because of recent events in Europe and in Africa, the civilized world is confronted with the actual prospect of a new World War, more terrible in its implications than that which only a few years ago brought death to millions of human beings, and grief and misery unparalleled to countless other millions throughout the world.

Henry George considered himself a citizen of the world. The concept of freedom which is at the base of his teachings, meant to him freedom for men everywhere under the sun. We know that he did not esteem mere political freedom for which men in all lands have striven mightily as essentially important unless the proceeds of government served to arrive at economic freedom. Without the establishment of economic freedom in producing wealth, and justice in its distribution, he predicted that

increasing wealth in any land must benefit the few rather than the many. Free governments, even when democratically controlled, would, without economic freedom, have no tendency to extirpate poverty and the social evils which poverty engenders and no influence in elevating society as a whole, or in lightening the burdens of those compelled to toil for a living.

It seems to us as students of Henry George, that there is an inevitable relationship and interdependence between the causes of war and those causes that produce periodical industrial depressions and widespread poverty in all lands. George realized this nearly sixty years ago, and recently, as some of you may know, his daughter, Anna George de Mille, resurrected a remarkable but forgotten passage in an address which her father made in which he forecast the idea of a league of nations that forty years later was called into being by the vision of a President of the United States. Here in his own words is the vision of Henry George in 1877:

"It is too soon to hope that it may be the mission of this Republic to unite all nations of English speech whether they grow beneath the Northern star or Southern cross, in a League, which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a past age and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

Let me repeat for emphasis, Henry George's vision of an International League:

"which, by insuring justice, promoting peace, and liberating commerce, will be the forerunner of a world wide federation that will make war the possibility of a last age, and turn to works of usefulness the enormous forces now dedicated to destruction."

This may recall to some of you the language of Locksley Hall, that noble poem of Tennyson with his notable prophecy of the ultimate coming into being of a "Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World." Only today I was told at the New York Public Library that Tennyson's famous poem was not published until 1886, or eight years after the utterance of the noble vision of Henry George.

Our present League of Nations seems to have been the concept of Woodrow Wilson, whose primary idea of putting an end to war through an approach to economic freedom was lost in the shuffle of the treaty makers at Versailles. You will recall that in his Fourteen Points upon which the war Armistice was granted, Wilson contended for

"the removal so far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all nations consenting to the Peace, and associate themselves for its maintenance."

And now may I recite a little history which particularly relates to the guests from over-seas who are with me on this platform this evening.

Nine years ago, a splendid international gathering of followers of Henry George assembled in the beautiful city of Copenhagen in Denmark, over which I had the great honor to preside. Through the influence of Mr. Folke, one of our guests tonight, who is the splendid leader of the Henry George movement in the Danish kingdom, his government extended extraordinary courtesies and honors to the International Congress of Georgeists there assembled. The Parliament houses were turned over to us, and the government radio station and noted cabinet ministers addressed our meeting.

Subsequently in London, there came into existence the formal organization of the International Union for Free Trade and Land Value Taxation which, in 1929, held another notable conference in Edinburgh. Its formal object may be compressed into this sentence, taken from its Constitution:

"To stimulate in all countries a public opinion favorable to permanent peace and prosperity to all people, through the progressive removal of the basic economic causes of war as these causes are demonstrated in the writings of Henry George."

Now, a year after the great Copenhagen meeting of Georgeists attended by the representatives of twenty-six countries, the Council of the League of Nations at Geneva, issued a call for an economic conference designed to find a way to end the new World War, that is, the economic war that was then and is still going on between the countries which participated in the making of the Treaty of Versailles, which had been ostensibly designed to put an end to the wars of the future. The multiplication of trade barriers, of tariffs and quotas, of import and export restrictions, and other interferences with the basic right of friendly peoples to do business with one another, was not only destroying the possibility of economic recovery but it was generating hates and fears and jealousies and bitterness. These conditions were leading many of the nations to a vast increase of destructive armament, on the sea, on the land, and in the air. "Something must be done about it!" was the idea behind the calling of that first Economic Conference of the League of Nations,—a recognition of the Georgeist contention that the fundamental causes of war are economic in their character.

Well, this young International organization of ours with its headquarters in London, decided not to wait for the unlikely event of an invitation to attend this League of Nations Conference. It prepared an address to Geneva, an address printed in a number of European languages, in which the official delegates of the League of Nations were told what was the matter with the world

and how it might be cured. I have a copy of that historic document here tonight in the English language, and it seems to me it is as true tonight and as prophetic as it was seven years ago when our committee, consisting of Arthur Madsen, our International linguist, accompanied by F. C. R. Douglas, great economist of our movement on the other side of the sea, presented their argument informally and unofficially to the statesmen of fifty nations who had been called to find a way to end the economic war that was then and is still going on.

The statesmen were reminded that the world of today constitutes a single economic organization, for there is no longer any nation which can call itself self-sufficient. Division of labor has long ago transcended national boundaries, and the argument for the necessity of free intercourse and trade between nations, has now acquired an overwhelming significance because the interdependence of peoples is greater now than ever before.

We told the statesmen at Geneva that the international division of labor is the economic basis of civilized life, and that the duty of Governments now is to reconcile the legitimate claims of nationalism with that economic internationalism which has grown up in spite of statesmen, everywhere.

We pointed out that the impoverishment of people in Europe and elsewhere, the growth of unemployment, reduction of wages, and the gross inequalities in distribution of wealth due to land monopoly and oppressive taxation were giving rise to problems of more than national importance. These things were creating a state of mind among the masses of every country which, on the one hand threatened stability of governments, and on the other hand encouraged the idea of economic improvement by means of territorial expansion at the expense of backward and distant people.

We pointed to the antagonism and friction caused by interference through tariffs and through other means, with the normal exchange of the products of labor between friendly peoples. We pointed to the fact that the struggle for new markets and the sources of raw materials stimulated the demand for colonial expansion, for trade concessions and for protectorates.

When one reads this document of the Georgeists International union today, one sees how prophetic it was when it pointed out that it was a truism of historical study that the struggle for raw materials and new markets expressing itself in colonial expansion and the forcible annexation of territories, the establishment of treaty ports, and resorts to war for extension of colonial possessions, has been one of the chief causes of international jealousies and discord.

We have only to point across the sea to Geneva tonight where the dire issue of war or peace hangs as if by a slender thread, to realize how clear was the vision of the followers of Henry George whose plea to that Economic Conference was ignored when we asked for the breaking down of

tariff barriers, the existence of which were plainly inconsistent with a League pledged to the maintenance of world peace so long as public policies should continue to be based on the theory that the producers in one nation should aim to bring advantage to themselves at the expense of the producers of another nation.

We pointed out that there could be no permanent political peace in the world in the face of a continuance of economic war.

Well, it is now history that the first great Economic Conference of the League of Nations adjourned without action or agreement upon action. In a scornful editorial at that time, the *Manchester Guardian* declared that the Conference was but a waste of time and that it ended simply in oratory and futility.

I have never been convinced, however, that our arguments were without influence at that Conference, because I know first that our indefatigable linguist, Mr. Madsen, was so tireless in the distribution and accentuation of our argument that he seemed to have impressed the splendid President of the Conference, Mons. Theunis of Belgium, who, in a final review at the close of the Conference, used this language:

"The main trouble of the world today is neither any material shortage in the resources of nature, nor any inadequacies in man's power to exploit them. It is all, in one form or another, a maladjustment—not an insufficient productive capacity, but a series of impediments to the full utilization of that capacity. The main obstacles to economic revival have been the hindrances opposed to the free flow of labor, of capital, and of goods."

A better argument for what was then and what is now the matter with the world, or a better argument for Henry George's philosophy of freedom, as a cure for it all, could hardly be made by Mr. Madsen himself.

Well, there have been other Economic Conferences held since then, and many Conferences looking to the disarmament of nations, all of which have led to the same end,—speeches and futility.

But the Henry George International Union with its friends, and followers of Henry George in many lands, will still carry on, realizing that the great truth which our inspired leader, Henry George, sought to make plain, for the benefit of mankind everywhere, must, in the Providence of God, ultimately triumph if there is to come an era of enduring Peace and Prosperity for the peoples of the world.

**N**OW, is it not as much an impairment of the right of property to take a lamb as to take a sheep? To take five per cent or twenty per cent as to take a hundred per cent? We would leave the whole of the value produced by individual exertion to the individual. We would respect the rights of property not to any limited extent, but fully.—Henry George, San Francisco, Feb., 1890.

## The Keynote Convention Speech, 1940

By HON. B. A. PARTYMAN

### A Story of Tax Relief for Land and of New Deal Prosperity

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

Author of "The Economic Basis of Tax Reform"

(Concluded)

IT is true that some of the business men and landowners and owners of natural resources did not like to have their production restricted. But these were easily mollified by the benefit payments given them for holding their land out of use. And nearly all of the truly practical men felt that the output of their competitors ought to be restricted, in order that prices might be kept high enough and that land values might be kept high. So it was not merely or even chiefly academic advisors who supported these measures but influential business men and landowners,—the really practical men of affairs. Indeed, many of the narrow-minded and theoretical academic economists were so wedded to their outmoded ideas of competition that they were unable to comprehend the advantages of the new policy.

Special measures were necessary to control the output of oil and to raise the royalties of owners of oil wells. In this industry, merely withdrawing a part of the land from use was not enough, because the oil flowed underground and, by drilling on some land, oil could be drained from beneath other land. Much was made of the importance of conserving the oil resource of the nation for future generations. A few critics of the restriction policy suggested that something could be done by removing the tariff on oil brought from foreign countries, so that our resources could be saved for posterity. But this, of course, would not have met the need, for it would have kept down the price of oil, whereas what was wanted was to have a high price of oil and high royalties to the owners of oil wells and high values for oil-bearing lands and, therefore, greater general prosperity. Various restrictive devices were adopted under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, to realize these ends. Of course, recovery was thereby greatly promoted.

To make especially certain that there would not be too large a production of coal or too many jobs mining coal or too low a scale of royalties for coal mine owners or too low a value of coal mines, Senator Y. introduced a bill providing for the appropriation of \$300,000,000 of Federal funds to buy up some of the poorer coal mines and withhold them from use.

Although Senator Y. appears not to have publicly announced these aims, it would surely be a gross insult

to his intelligence to suppose him unfamiliar with the President's principles of the manifest consistency of his own bill with these principles.

Unfortunately, some of the most important New Deal legislation was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Certain opposition conservatives were delighted at this, saying it meant the end of restriction and regimentation. But the outstanding liberal and progressive leaders of our great party of the common people rightly pointed out that the Supreme Court was standing in the very path of progress, that it was applying the outworn legal interpretations and principles of the horse and buggy era to an age of steam and electricity and gasoline, an age when it was superlatively important that a sufficient amount of land and sites and natural resources should be held out of use so as to decrease production and hold prices up and maintain and increase land values and give the common people more employment and make the nation more prosperous. The constitution should be changed, therefore, to permit the Federal government to do anything which might be necessary to accomplish these ends and, especially, to preserve and increase the high land values which are the only sure foundation of prosperity. The common people quickly came to realize the overwhelming importance of this and the constitution was accordingly modernized.

Of course almost everyone understood by this time that the more land that was withdrawn from use the less goods could be produced, and that the prices of goods were thereby increased and the competition to use land intensified and that land rents and land values were thus raised and all the people made more prosperous. But now there began to be noted a most amazing phenomenon which neither the brain trusters nor the practical politicians nor even the substantial business men were able, for a long time, to explain to the common people, although some of the literary intelligentsia said they had understood it all along. Since the people were more prosperous, they could have more to enjoy and more goods had to be produced for them. Thus, the more land was taken out of production and the more the output of goods was restricted thereby, the more goods were produced. The common people, so to speak, enjoyed and produced more because they produced less, as well as because they paid more of this less for less space on which to produce less and thus have more. Some sceptics said that all this could not possibly be true. But Prof. G., perhaps the most eminent of American mathematicians, worked out a series of equations by which the phenomenon could be beautifully and clearly explained, at least to all those who could understand the equations.

\* \* \*

As the people of the nation became more and more intellectually acute through contemplation and admiration of the New Deal policy and of its marvelous con-

sequences, it became possible to extend this policy in ways that before would have been impossible because the people would not have been intellectually capable of understanding their advantages and, therefore, would not have supported them. So now the President began planning a further application of the great principle of raising the value of land. After a series of conferences with officers of the National Real Estate Board and with leading landowners and with the eminent academic authorities on taxation and finance, Prof. L. and Prof. S., and with Dr. Z. and Senator X., the President made his new plan public and explained its significance.

But first he reminded the people of the country, and especially the common people, that the essence of his entire programme was the raising and maintaining of the price of land, that, as had often been stated, high land values are the foundation of prosperity, that land values had been made higher by reducing, in all of the States, the taxes on land, so that the owners of land could now keep for themselves nearly all of the community-produced rent of land instead of having a considerable fraction of it taxed into the public treasury, and that land values had been further raised by giving landowners, out of the processing taxes, large benefit payments for withdrawing land from use. In short, the rest of the people, under the new system, were paying each year larger sums than ever before to the owners of land for permission to live and to work in the United States, and especially in those parts of the country having great situation advantages due almost wholly to community growth and development. Obviously, if ways could be devised by which the rest of the people might be made to pay still more to the owners of land for permission to live and to work in the United States than they were now paying, this would make the land values of the nation higher than they already were and so would make the nation yet more prosperous.

So the President said he thought it would be a logical extension and improvement of his system, to increase the processing taxes and the taxes on sales, on motion pictures and on incomes earned as salaries and wages by the labor of the people and incomes from constructed capital accumulated by the people's thrift, and to give the extra revenue received to the owners of land as a bonus. The States should co-operate by removing all remaining taxes on land. His specific proposal was to give every landowner, out of taxes, one additional dollar for each dollar he was already receiving.

The only vocal objection to this proposal, which seems worth mentioning, came from some landowners who thought it would make the nation still more prosperous to give them, instead, two dollars for every dollar they were now getting and thus increase the value of their land by two hundred per cent instead of only one hundred. But the President felt it better not to risk

getting ahead of public opinion and, therefore, did not ask Congress to go so far.

An administration measure providing for the one hundred per cent landowners' bonus was quickly introduced into Congress. Some of the members of Congress, as it happened, did not at first support the President in his proposal but, when a bonus army of landowners was organized and began to march on Washington singing the Marseillaise, the opposition capitulated and the measure was enacted into law.

One of the splendid and, probably, unanticipated results of this latest New Deal enactment was pointed out, several months after the passage of the law giving a bonus to all landowners, by Mrs. W., a prominent clubwoman and a well known patroness of art. The President's policy was bringing about, she said, the greatest esthetic development the nation had ever had. Landowners were receiving such large rents that they could not spend their incomes in the ordinary ways to which they had become accustomed, so now they were purchasing paintings and statuary for themselves and, indeed, of themselves, and endowing art galleries in which even the poorest citizens could acquire taste and artistic discrimination; and the demand for works of art was stimulating an interest among young people in providing such works. Also, the palatial homes that the recipients of these large rents were building were often models of architectural beauty and were thus ideals to be aimed at by the common people when they bought land and built for themselves. So the President's New Deal policy had not only tremendously enhanced the material prosperity of the nation but had furthered the development, as well, of the things of the spirit.

Although Mrs. W. confined her comment to art, it is perhaps worth mentioning that universities and colleges were also endowed by the now superlatively prosperous landowners, in which the young people whose privilege it was to attend them studied not alone art and architecture and literature, but history and sociology and economics as well. In their classes in economics they learned to understand the President's economic policy and how it made the nation prosperous. Many of the poorer people of the nation, even yet, were not intellectually keen enough to see how the New Deal policy made them more prosperous, but the graduates of the universities and colleges endowed by the wealthy landowners and by the big stockholders of the giant corporations that owned the mines and power sites of the country, were usually able to see this.

It is true that once in a while the trustees of a college would discover a professor of economics whose teaching seemed to lead students away from the truth and to cloud their understanding. This, when it happened, was most regrettable. Of course all of the colleges maintained the great principle of academic freedom. No professor

was dismissed merely for holding unpopular opinions. Indeed, on a number of occasions, university presidents of great distinction went out of their way to defend professors who were being assailed for their opinions. For example, there was the case when President B. of Lanonia University received a letter from an Alabama cotton cropper criticizing the attitude of a professor on the land question as being unfriendly to tenant farmers. President B. issued an immediate denunciation of the protesting farmer as being a menace to the principle of freedom of thought and teaching in academic walls. President B's. courageous remonstrance against this ominous threat to freedom of research has since become one of the glorious memories of the American academic tradition.

But a professor might quite properly be dismissed for incompetence, and it was obvious to President B., as to the trustees who employed him, that a professor of economics who could not see and appreciate the truly impressive economic advantages of the New Deal policy of raising land values, was incompetent and no fit teacher of youth. So most of such professors were allowed to find other jobs.

Since, in spite of the high and increasing rents and land values and the great prosperity of the more substantial citizens, there seemed still to be some poverty among the working classes, a number of the more sympathetic among the wealthy felt that research was needed to discover the causes for this poverty in the midst of such superlatively favorable conditions. So research foundations were endowed and professors of economics, sociology, of statistics, of psychology, of biology and of history were drawn from the universities to direct the researches and to discover the individual and family and sociological and psychological and biological causes of poverty.

One or two voices were raised to say that it was easy enough for any one with horse sense and an open mind to discover the principal cause of poverty, that a horse—or even a jackass—never offers the horse flies that live from his blood an additional drop of blood for every drop they can extract without help but, on the contrary, switches at them with his tail as effectively, not to say viciously, as he knows how. But the critics who so spoke had obviously had no training in the technique of research.

The new endowments provided interesting work for many sociologists, economists and statisticians, and the researches led to the conclusion that there ought to be more attention paid to social work, including individual and family case work; and that higher sales taxes should be levied to pay for such service. So higher sales taxes were levied for this and also to raise money to train more students in economics, statistics, sociology, etc., so that the nation might have a still larger number of intelligent

and technically trained leaders in seeking the causes of poverty and the path of prosperity.

\* \* \*

When all the people—except a few of very low intelligence quotients—came to realize fully how greatly their prosperity had been increased by reducing and, finally, abolishing, taxes on land and sites and allowing all of the rents and royalties from sites and natural resources to be enjoyed by private owners for giving others permission to live on the land and make use of these resources; and when they realized how the property values of the nation had been still further increased by the processing taxes and by using the money to make special rental payments to landowners for holding more land out of use than they were already holding; and when they saw how giving a bonus to all landowners on all of their land, to the extent of one hundred per cent of the rent they were receiving, had raised land values to even greater heights; efforts were made to work out further extensions of the plan, which would enrich the nation even more.

At first, no one, not even the smartest brain truster, could think of anything which promised any further accession of prosperity. At length, however, a scheme was worked out in conference by the President, Senator X. and Dr. Z., which seemed likely to bring to final fruition the series of reformist and prosperity-building measures that the President and his cabinet and administration leaders had sponsored. The idea was, to extend the principle of private and corporate collection of land rent from those permitted to work and to live on the earth and to enjoy community-produced situation advantages, and make it apply likewise to the use of the oceans and of inland lakes and rivers. Because of the difficulty of getting an international agreement on the matter, no charge could be made for the use of the oceans beyond the three-mile limit, but arrangements were made that far.

To begin with, of course, it was necessary to get sections of the oceans, lakes and rivers reduced to private and corporate ownership. The method selected for doing this had the further advantage of saving the government expense. Those who were being paid by the government for holding land out of use or who were receiving bonuses, were given the option of being paid their benefits or their bonuses wholly in money or partly in tapering ribbon-like sections of ocean (or lake or river) leading to a port. If they accepted the latter alternative—and many did—they could thereafter, besides collecting from industry and commerce for granting permission to use the earth, also collect from commerce for granting permission to use these ribbons of ocean.

Special electrical devices were invented whereby it became possible to know what routes vessels followed to port after coming within the three-mile limit, and each ribbon owner was allowed to make his own charge to ships coming into or leaving port over his ribbon of ocean.

This wise enactment enhanced still more the property values of the nation. For now there was added to the value of the land, due to the fact that owners could charge users for permission to live or to work on it or otherwise enjoy its advantages, the value of the ribbons of ocean resulting from the fact that private owners could henceforth charge others for permission to sail over or ship or receive goods over their ribbons.

An incidental advantage of the new scheme was that it hastened the disappearance of that lingering anachronism, the sailing vessel. Whenever the wind was unfavorable, sailing vessels were compelled to tack and thus had to sail over so many ribbons and pay rent to so many ribbon owners, that these vessels were utterly unable to operate at a profit. So the new plan furthered technological progress.

There was one temporary difficulty which, however, was soon overcome. In the case of some of the harbors, the ribbon routes by which ships could enter and leave were so numerous, and competition among the ribbon owners was so keen, that only very small rentals could be charged, and so the ribbons had only small value and could not add to the prosperity of the nation as much as they should have done. But as soon as this was noted, the President conferred with Dr. Z. on the matter, after which he had introduced into Congress an administration measure which provided that, in all such cases, enough of the ribbon strips should be withdrawn from possible use, with compensatory payment to their owners from special tariff duties and new processing taxes, so that the rents and sale prices of the ribbon strips would be raised to a reasonable figure. Then, as the brain trusters and the landowners had foreseen, there was a further increase of business activity and employment. For, as administration leaders hereafter stated the great New Deal formula and principle: high land values and high ribbon strip values are the foundation of prosperity.

\* \* \*

One other and final measure, rounding out and bringing to a fitting climax the truly great policies of the administration in providing a New Deal for the common people, certainly deserves to be explained. This was the provision by which all non-landowners should, upon meeting landowners or, at any rate, upon meeting the larger landowners, for the transaction of any kind of business or upon social occasions, remove their hats and bow very low three times. Of course they were to bow similarly to the owners of the ocean ribbons.

When this law was first proposed, there was some criticism expressed of it on the ground that it served no good purpose and that it was un-American and an aping of the aristocratic forms of monarchist nations. But both of these criticisms were unjustified, as the President pointed out in one of his intimate radio talks to the people. In the first place, he explained, the provision for respectful triple obeisance would serve a most useful and im-

portant purpose, indeed, the very same purpose as all his other measures, in that its enactment would make land more valuable and thereby vastly increase the prosperity of our great country. When landowners were treated with the respect due to their ownership, more people would want to be landowners than had previously wanted to, so many of them would go without other things and try to spend their savings in buying land. But there was no more land than before, and the fact that landowners who continued to be landowners could have all other persons bow three times before them on every social and business occasion, would make them unwilling to sell and to thus cease to be landowners, except at such prices for land as had never before been dreamed of. Thus, land must rise greatly in price or value and the nation must become even more prosperous than it had already become.

To the charge that the suggested new law was un-American, the President had an answer equally conclusive. The system he had proposed differed from the systems of old-world countries, he said, because those to whom honor was paid were not born irrevocably to this honor nor did they have it thrust upon them, but they must acquire it, or, at any rate, hold on to it; and in America, the land of equal opportunity for all, any one could qualify for the honor of being thus triply bowed to, merely by saving enough to buy a sizable piece of land. America could still be the country of the self-made man as much as it had ever been, and now land values would overtop all previous records. Besides, if it was good for the poorer people to have to pay landowners rent for community-produced advantages, and for permission to live and to work in the United States, and to pay taxes to construct roads and streets and public buildings, and to pay processing taxes to reward landowners for withdrawing land from use, and to pay taxes to provide money to give bonuses to landowners, all because the value of land was raised thereby, then certainly it must be good for them to do just a little harmless bowing and scraping if this would also raise the value of land, as of course it would. The President's logic was so forceful and convincing that Congress passed the desired legislation without debate and, indeed, with whoops of enthusiasm.

There was a little difficulty at first because so much of the land and natural resources of the country was owned by corporations, such as coal mining companies and steel companies and power plants and big retail establishments and real estate companies. The common people did not know whether to bow to the corporation buildings or to the officers. But this difficulty was most happily resolved by the Supreme Court which decided that ownership, like guilt, was personal and that if any individual owned enough of the stock or the bonds of a corporation which owned a great deal of land, then he was entitled to receive the prescribed triple obeisance.



Such large owners of corporation securities might wear a special kind of mark on their clothing to distinguish them. If they neglected to wear this mark then they must not complain in case they failed to receive the proper obeisance. But, fortunately, there were quite a few cases where upstart chain-store and other corporations were doing business on land owned by and leased from old residents of their cities, scions of the finest and oldest families, and then all the employees of these corporations had to show proper respect whenever they sold goods to these old residents or paid rent to them or met them on social occasions.

It should be noted, in passing, that the obeisance law corrected an evil result of the previous tax relief and New Deal legislation which even the wisest statesmen and scholars and brain trusters had not anticipated. The common people, such as the cotton croppers and other farm tenants and city laborers, were becoming so fat and sleek from overfeeding, because they were now so prosperous, due to land values being so high, due to the high rents and taxes and bonuses they were paying for permission to work and live on the earth, that some of them were hardly able to sit down. But now the many and rapid obeisances that were constantly required of them, caused them to sweat profusely and lose weight rapidly, without having to consume dangerous proprietary anti-fat preparations, and so they regained their previous sylph-like forms and, indeed, even better forms. Thus the New Deal policy not only raised land values and increased prosperity and promoted art and architecture and the intellectual life and things of the spirit generally, but it gave the people more attractive and youthful-looking waistlines than they had ever had before.

There were a few conservative people who somehow failed to understand the full logic of the President's policy in this matter and who demanded that similar obeisance should be offered to persons not owning any land, provided they owned a sufficient amount of other property, e.g., valuable machinery, buildings or merchandise on land owned by and leased from others. Like the socialists, and the parlor pinks of the *New Republic* and other high-brow magazine variety, these conservatives stressed no distinction between community-produced land value on the one hand and constructed capital on the other hand. But administration leaders seemed clearly to understand this distinction, for they pointed out to the people that by giving special honors to the owners of capital the government could not, in any appreciable degree, raise the value of capital, since, even if people wanted more of it and were willing to buy more this increased desire could easily be met by increasing the amount of capital constructed. But the amount of space and natural resources, as distinct from buildings and improvements and other capital, could not be thus increased; and so, when more people wanted land

and wanted it more desperately, the value of land rose and the nation became accordingly more prosperous.

By the time the new law had been in effect a very few months, the people became at last thoroughly familiar with the President's New Deal principles, saw clearly the philosophy of the law, and bowed and scraped on every proper occasion, to the great gratification of landowners, and with a great increase in the desire to be landowners and in competition to buy land, and with a correspondingly great rise in the value of land and in the prosperity of the nation, and with a final and thorough discrediting of all those impractical theorists, such as Single Taxers, who would use the annual community-produced situation rent of land as a principal source of public revenue and who would untax, so far as possible, the earnings of labor, all buildings and improvements produced by labor, and the necessities of the poor.

It is, indeed, an inspiration to all understanding minds and hearts, on any morning or afternoon or evening, to see such assiduous bending and straightening on the part of so many people, in the stores, in the hotels, at teas and receptions and on all the highways and byways of the nation, and to realize that the impressive and courtly ceremonies of the past have not vanished forever from the earth, but are doing their significant part to increase the value of the land and, with it, the prosperity of our great country.

\* \* \*

And now, as this wonderful and extraordinary eight-year period draws to a close, we ask for the whole-hearted support of all the friends of labor and of the common people, regardless of previous political affiliations. This support we ask for in order that no backward step may be taken, in order that the sacred rights of property of those who have purchased land relying on a continuance of established policy may not suffer infringement, and in order that the splendid and prosperity-building American system of paying rent and still more rent, and of paying bonuses besides, to individuals and to private corporations for permitting us to use natural resources and community-produced advantages, and the great American ideal of keeping land values high, may never fade from the minds of patriotic American citizens but may go on to gladden the hearts of forgotten men yet unborn.

“**S**UPPOSING the entire habitable globe to be enclosed, it follows that if the landowners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not landowners have no right at all to its surface. Hence such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by the permission of the lords of the soil, they can have no room for the soles of their feet. Nay, should the others think fit to deny them resting place, these landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether.”—HERBERT SPENCER, *Social Statics*.

## Across the Country With the Henry George School of Social Science---All Aboard!

CINCINNATI, O.—Three classes. Enrollment of 68. Advertising of classes consisted in mailing out 250 announcements, placing posters in all public libraries and many drug stores, and broadcasting one or two minute "flashes" over a local radio station. Class instructors include a minister and two lawyers.

CLEVELAND, O.—Three classes, also enrollment of 85. Meet in John Marshall School of Law and a downtown public school building. Here we see a strong student alumni council. "The general enthusiasm of these students of the prior classes is most stimulating and is a splendid testimonial of the effectiveness of the Cleveland Extension," writes Francis J. Fee, Secretary of Philadelphia's Student Alumni Council who recently visited Cleveland. The Cleveland Council publishes a monthly bulletin, *The Answer*.

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Demands are so great on Prof. Richard E. (Dick) Howe that he's expecting to devote all his time to organizing and teaching classes within a 50-mile radius of the Smoky City of Mayor William N. McNair, S. T. Pittsburgh has its own school quarters in the downtown Keystone building. It has an advanced class in "Protection or Free Trade" under Chief Assessor Percy R. Williams. Other teachers: City Assessor Hugo Noren and City Architect Robert C. Bowers.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—A high school teacher, Julian P. Hickok, is Extension Secretary for Philadelphia and was one of the first to organize and conduct an extension class. Had one or two classes last year. One started Oct. 8 with an enrollment of 30. Another started Nov. 7. The Student Alumni Council, of which Mr. Fee is secretary, is active.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The first classes in the Nation's Capitol are to start shortly after the first of the year. The instructor will be Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, inventor of the famous Landlord's Game. Among the sponsors are Mrs. Louis F. Post and Rev. John C. Palmer.

NEW YORK CITY.—Classes at National Headquarters are booming. There are thirteen classes with an enrollment of 300. This is the response to 6,000 announcements. Fifteen thousand will be in the mails for the winter classes opening the week of Jan. 6. A teacher's training class has proven very useful and popular. Membership is limited to graduates of the course which uses "Progress and Poverty" as the textbook. A journalism class is now being conducted to train graduates in writing Georgeist articles for newspapers and magazines.

BOSTON, MASS.—Classes started Nov. 15. Meet in an art gallery. "About sixty-five people turned up at

the first meeting of the class on Friday! We were prepared for over fifty, but a few had to sit on the tables," writes Mrs. Francis G. Goodale, Extension Secretary. "We shall certainly have to divide the class into two groups,—probably three."

CHICOPEE FALLS, MASS.—Writes Instructor John B. Knight: "I started my class on Oct. 23 with an enrollment of eight young men, all between the ages of 21 and 26. The boys are certainly showing a surprising amount of interest and from their questions and answers they are evidently working hard on the lessons. The discussions are most interesting and I am certainly getting a great kick out of the class."

DETROIT, MICH.—One fine class of 40 students with a good professor, Attorney Henry C. L. Forler. Meets in the Public Library.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Attorney Louis B. Schwartz had two or three successful classes last spring and is starting out with a large one this fall. Expects 300 graduates this school year. Frank Chodorov carried the idea to Minneapolis and Mr. Schwartz did the rest.

SPRINGFIELD, MO.—Until this fall Dr. J. V. Boswell was the only Henry George man in Springfield, Mo. He will not be alone however when his class is completed. It began on Friday evening, Oct. 11, meeting in the Senior High School. Enrollment upwards of 30. The daily papers have given the class extensive publicity. "Henry George is really the teacher," Doctor Boswell told a local reporter. "I merely conduct the class."

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Edward White, Extension Secretary and instructor for Kansas City, circularized members of labor unions and secured a good enrollment for his first class.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.—First class opened Nov. 1. Enrollment, 36. "How many of these will stick is of course a question of how interesting we can make the studies," writes Mr. E. M. Stagland, Extension Secretary. This is written in the spirit that will make the class successful!

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.—There are five classes in the greater Los Angeles district: one each in Pasadena, Glendale, Long Beach, Santa Ana, and Los Angeles proper. This growth is a tribute to the several instructors and to Mr. C. W. Silvernale, Extension Secretary for Southern California.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—The city that gave us "Progress and Poverty" will not be without a class, thanks to Noah Alper, who writes, "I will surely have a variety of types of students and some very brilliant people."

On this trip we've had to make only limited stops. We've not had a chance to visit Selma, Alabama, Canton and Peoria, Ill., Columbus and Youngstown, O., Fall River, Mass., and some thirty other centers where classes are now being conducted. Take another trip with us in the next issue of LAND AND FREEDOM!

## Extension Classes of the Henry George School

### ALABAMA

SELMA. *Instructor:* William H. Dinkins, A. M., President, Selma University.

### CALIFORNIA

GLENDALE. *Instructor:* Hollis C. Joy, 1850 Verdugo Knolls Drive.

LONG BEACH. *Instructor:* F. Darwin Smith, President, California College of Commerce.

LOS ANGELES. *Extension Secretary for Southern California:* C. W. Silvernale, 7356 Willoughby Avenue. *Instructor:* Harry Farrell, 8721 Olympic Avenue.

PASADENA. *Instructor:* George E. Lee, 1900 Paloma Street.

SAN DIEGO. *Extension Secretary:* E. M. Stangland, 2660 National Avenue.

SAN FRANCISCO. *Extension Secretary:* N. D. Alper, 83 McAllister Street.

SANTA ANA. *Instructor:* Ben E. Tarver, Suite 418, Otis Building.

### CONNECTICUT

HARTFORD. *Instructor:* Mrs. Nathan Hillman, 19 West Raymond Street.

NORFOLK. *Instructor:* Joseph R. Carroll.

STRATFORD. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Lee, 219 Burritt Avenue.

WATERBURY. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. Royal E. S. Hayes, 314 W. Main Street.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Elizabeth M. Phillips, 2309 N. Custis Road, Clarendon, Va.

### ILLINOIS

CANTON. *Instructor:* Mabell Brooks, Moran Apts.

CHICAGO. *Extension Secretary:* Maurice Welty, 4833 Dakin Street.

OAK PARK. *Extension Secretary:* J. Edward Jones, 137 N. Marion Street.

PEORIA. *Extension Secretary:* Albert Henniges, 326 Harrison Street.

### MASSACHUSETTS

ANNISQUAM. *Instructor:* James B. Ellery.

BOSTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Francis G. Goodale, 79 Webster Road, Weston, Mass.

CHICOPEE FALLS. *Instructor:* John B. Knight, 91 Main Street.

FALL RIVER. *Instructor:* Rev. William R. Reid, 373 N. Main Street.

SANDWICH. *Instructor:* Lincoln Crowell.

SOUTH EGREMONT. *Extension Secretary:* John M. Miller,

### MICHIGAN

CEDAR SPRINGS. *Instructor:* J. S. Tindall.

DETROIT. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Palmer, 1257 National Bank Building.

GRAND RAPIDS. *Extension Secretary:* M. Herman Friedrich, 701 Livingston, N.E.

### MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS. *Instructor:* Louis B. Schwartz, 310 McKnight Building.

### MISSOURI

KANSAS CITY. *Extension Secretary:* Edward White, 300 La Salle Building.

SPRINGFIELD. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. J. V. Boswell, 823 Woodruff Building.

### NEW HAMPSHIRE

EAST ALSTEAD. *Instructor:* Hartley Dennett.

### NEW JERSEY

NEWARK. *Instructor:* Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen, Jacksonville Road, Towaco, N. J.

WESTFIELD. *Instructor:* Edwin J. Jones, 311 Prospect Street.

### NEW YORK

BROOKLYN. *Instructor:* John Luxton, 496 E. 46th Street. *Instructor:* David Chodorov, Executive's Secretarial Training School, 1560 Flatbush Avenue.

BRONX. *Instructor:* Max Berkowitz, 655 E. 223rd Street.

FLORAL PARK, L. I. *Instructor:* Leonard T. Recker, 230 W. 17th Street, New York City.

MIDDLETOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Candace B. Fuller, 128 Academy Road.

NEW YORK CITY. *National Headquarters:* O. K. Dorn, Business Manager, 211 West 79th Street.

SCHENECTADY. *Extension Secretary:* W. W. Munro, R. D. No. 3.

### OHIO

CINCINNATI. *Extension Secretary:* E. E. Hardcastle, Union Central Life Insurance Co.

CLEVELAND. *Extension Secretary:* Virgil D. Allen, 2304 Bellfield Road, Cleveland Heights.

COLUMBUS. *Extension Secretary:* J. H. Kauffman, 403 State House Annex.

YOUNGSTOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Charles C. McGowan, 25 S. Hazel Street.

### PENNSYLVANIA

BEAVER. *Instructor:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PHILADELPHIA. *Extension Secretary:* Julian P. Hickok, 315 Zeralda Street.

PITTSBURGH. *Extension Secretary:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone Building.

SOMERSET. *Instructor:* Ernest O. Kooser.

## TEXAS

HOUSTON. *Instructor:* Mrs. Bessie Beach Truehart, 5308 Alameda Road.

## WASHINGTON

ALDERWOOD MANOR. *Instructor:* W. H. Proctor.

TACOMA. *Instructor:* Robert S. Doubleday, 2306 S. Yakima Avenue.

## CANADA

MILK RIVER, ALBERTA. *Instructor:* J. B. Ellert.

TORONTO, ONTARIO. *Instructors:* Alan C. Thompson, 100 Lombard Street. Miss Dorothy E. Coate, Rosseau, Ontario.

## MEXICO

MONTEREY. *Instructor:* E. S. Westrup, Ave Morales 132, Ote.

## Activities of The Manhattan Single Tax Club

**T**HOUGH the club is active in correspondence, sending out literature, and its president is addressing such service clubs, church and civic organizations as he can get opportunities to, the principal activity, at present, is the president's radio addresses; in fact, Mr. Ingersoll's acknowledged interest in the past year or two has been mainly in stabilizing and standardizing his messages to the general public, delivered through the microphone.

Mr. Ingersoll believes that through this channel, the Georgeist movement has an open door to widespread propaganda—at least as extensive as Father Coughlin's; and he is bending every effort to the perfection of technique: first, in making statements that are free from obscurities, and that effectively connect our simple philosophy with the uneducated mind. Second, associating the message with familiar events; and without dragging Single Tax in by the ears. Third, technique of delivery and relationship with stations.

Mr. Ingersoll is determined to have a medium for reproducing his broadcasts, especially for the few friends now supporting his work.

The current schedule is given here; it averages about twenty broadcasts weekly, requiring six originals, the preparation of which requires a minimum of five hours each.

### CHARLES H. INGERSOLL'S BROADCASTING SCHEDULE

Monday. WVFV—9:30 a.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Tuesday. WLTH—1:15 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Wednesday. WWRL—1:15 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Thursday. WBBC—12:45 p.m.; WCNW—2:30 p.m.; WHOM—7:30 p.m.

Friday. WILM (Wilmington)—3:15 p.m.; WDAS (Phila.)—5:30 p.m.

Saturday. WDAS (Phila.)—10:45 a.m.; WWRL—10:45 p.m.

HARRIET SAWYER, Secretary.

## Report of Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

**F**OLLOWING the printing of the letter of Lord Snowden in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, it was decided to reproduce the message in full, in circular form, so that it could be broadcast to the best of our ability among people whose interest in free trade and the land question might be awakened. A total of 11,000 people were circularized, this list including our Single Tax friends of the movement who have been interested in the books of Henry George, high school teachers, librarians, editors and many of the new students who have gone through classes in "Progress and Poverty." As a result, we have received hundreds of interesting letters and a demand for "Protection or Free Trade" as well as other writings of Henry George.

At the request of the Alumni Council group in Cleveland, Mr. Byron C. Taylor, Secretary, we circularized a list of ministers in Cleveland, writing a special letter calling attention to the pamphlet "Moses." Copy of this pamphlet was sent with each letter and some fine replies were received. The Alumni Council supplied one half of the expense of this work, the Foundation meeting the other half. This is one good way of doing constructive work under the guidance of alumni groups. A plan is evolved, the local situation is developed, and the Foundation then helps to the extent that it can in the furtherance of the project. It is on this basis that we have continued to supply the libraries of Georgia in conjunction with the generous gifts that Mr. H. C. Harris has made, in placing Henry George books in every library in the State of Georgia.

Likewise, recently a list of Rabbis in Bronx County were supplied with the pamphlet "Moses" at the suggestion of Mr. Edward Polak. Mr. Walter Mendelson of Germantown suggested gifts of books to certain libraries in Shady-side and Neffs, Ohio, which are for the aid and information of the coal miners—a project which is sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee for coal areas.

The opportunities to individual Single Taxers as well as to alumni groups who, graduating from one of the Extension Classes, are looking for constructive things to do, are numerous. Libraries, both educational and public, need more copies of Henry George's books. An alumni group can combine, or an individual can offer to give a certain amount towards the placing of books in these libraries. Groups in the community can be circularized with appropriate pamphlets and literature.

Graduates of classes can train themselves to speak before civic organizations, and, since we often have requests for speakers, we will be glad to hear from those who will volunteer to speak in their respective communities.

Recently, Mr. Elwood Lewis of Northport, N. Y. asked us for a speaker for the Rotary Club of Northport, and

Mr. Heman Chase was kind enough to accede to our request that he go to the meeting, and address the club on the subject of Single Tax.

One of the large Foundations asked us the other day for special information to be sent to Washington to one of the departments where an investigation was to be made of Single Tax Colonies, with a view to adopting, if practicable, the theory and operation of the existing colonies in an effort to spread the general work of re-settlement and homesteading.

Among the colleges and schools that have responded to recent material which we have sent out are the following:

Girls High School, City of Boston; Mount Vernon Junior College, Mount Vernon, Washington; New Jersey College for Women, Political Science Department, New Brunswick, New Jersey; Univeristy of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri; University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York; Iowa Pupils Reading Circle, Des Moines, Iowa; College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Arkansas; Catawba College, Sailsbury, North Carolina; Wayland College, Plainview, Texas.

From Clayton C. Kohl, State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, where, by the way, Mr. Monroe made interesting contacts in the earlier part of the year, we received the following letter:

"I am giving a course in "Progress and Poverty" this semester at the University here and I want all of my students, twelve in number, to read the book, which I feel is one of the really great books of history in its field. My students come in from twenty to thirty miles on Saturdays only. Kindly send twelve copies."

We sent Professor Kohl the twelve books ordered, a Teacher's Manual and a sheaf of all of the pamphlets we publish, that might be of interest to a teacher who is grooming his pupils for possible debate, etc.

One of the busiest phases of our work this fall has been the supplying of books and information to the Extension Classes which have started in various cities. Elsewhere, Mr. Monroe lists the teachers who are conducting classes this season, and it will suffice to say that considerable correspondence has been held with each of these teachers at the time of organization of the classes. A total of 800 books shipped from September 1, comprised forty-seven separate orders each involving, correspondence and arrangements for prompt and careful shipping.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

**W**HATEVER improves the condition of the lowest and broadest social stratum must promote the true interests of all. Where the wages of common labor are high and remunerative employment is easy to obtain, prosperity will be general. Where wages are highest, there will be the largest production and the most distribution of wealth. There will invention be most active and the brain best guide the hand.—"PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE."

GET your friends to subscribe to LAND AND FREEDOM.

## The Beginning of the Henry George Fellowship

**A** SHORT paragraph that I found on page 165 of the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM sent me to look for a few precious written pages which were enclosed a year and a half ago, in an envelope marked "The Henry George Fellowship—early beginnings." This envelope lies beside me now, that a few words may, later, be quoted from its contents, so that there shall be no misunderstanding about so significant an event as the launching of the Henry George Fellowship.

First, however, it should be explained that in Oct. 1933, driven by the great poverty and human need that I found in my work in a large public school, I set out to seek the true explanation of the fact that men with tools, who knew their trade, who had families for whom they were eager and willing to work, *could find no work*.

I therefore entered the Henry George School of Social Science as a student seeking to find an answer to the problem that confronted me, and was told simply and gravely by the Director, Oscar H. Geiger, that I should come to know it, in these words—"You will know."

Thus encouraged, I continued to attend the course and found that he was right. There was a solution, and he knew it. And it was because he knew it, and knew also how men and women needed to know it, that Oscar Geiger was devoting his life to teaching seventy students in his day-time, evenings, and correspondence classes. To this end he had invested all that he had. To this end he gladly devoted his great teaching gifts, shared his wide knowledge and exact information. Never can we who personally knew him be grateful enough for the 'quality' of life we saw in him, consecrated as it was to the great ideal of causing men to recognize that there is a Natural Law in the Economic World which *must* be obeyed, if men are ever to become truly free and equal. To him there was no other way.

We his students came to recognize this too, and at last, to have rise within us the question—"What are we going to do about it?"—just as he had been affected years before (we learned) when as a young man, he finished reading in a single night the copy of "Progress and Poverty" which Dr. James Ferrier had lent him. We saw that his own answer to the question must have been "Teach the truth!"—and that he was living up to this conviction. It was to find a part of my answer to this same question that I went to his home one evening, where I learned more fully of the School's needs and of his faith in his work as part of the Intent in Nature, due to be brought to fruition as truly as seed sown in the earth will grow, if sown according to nature's laws.

To the idea that there must be forming amongst the students of the various groups a desire to be of service to him in his work he listened with deep attention.

The suggestion that the very experience of learning such vital truths through his guidance should be arousing already a feeling of comradeship amongst his students—even though some were entirely unknown to the others—he accepted as in line with his own hope and thought.

The belief expressed that it would be inspiring to all to personally know, for instance, the two students who had brought so large a number of others to the classes, found him warmly interested.

Then he quietly and with deep feeling uttered these momentous words, "It has always been a dream of mine that there might be a Henry George Fellowship."

This caused the whole thing to crystallize, as it were, into the next question, "May I visit the classes next week to bring these things before them?" The answer was "yes."

And so on the days and evenings of the following week, beginning with April 9, 1934 this message was given to the classes:

"Fellow students of the Henry George School:—Greeting!

"Has it yet occurred to any of you that it would be a pleasant and worthwhile thing for the groups of students in this school, studying vital truths in a unique period of the world's history, to meet together for purposes of fellowship and cooperation for the good of the cause and the good of the school? . . . . .

"One of the chief objects of this meeting is the hope that we may through it feel ourselves in sympathy with a deep desire of our leader, Mr. Geiger, that there be formed a Fellowship, to be known as "The Henry George Fellowship." . . . . .

The students met on April 19, and listened to the following opening words I felt moved to make to them.

"This is possibly a historic date for the Henry George movement for we have come together as students and friends of this school to unite in an even closer bond of union to be known as the Henry George Fellowship. . . . Intuition perhaps, friendship perhaps, God I feel sure, led me to seek the realities under the effort I observed being made in this school . . . . without thought of personal reward, a true "seeking first the Kingdom of Heaven, a true trusting of the promise that all things needful would be added." . . . . .

Then was read a paper we now know as "The Message," and the students were asked to send in their written opinions of the school and its work, to add to it, in order that it might be sent out as a student-message to all the friends of the Henry George movement throughout the nation, announcing the formation of the Henry George Fellowship, and inviting their cooperation in sending students and supplying scholarships.

That evening the students voted to establish the Fellowship. The following week in flowed their written opinions, and the printed message went out May 28, 1934.

Thus we have seen the Henry George Fellowship in its earliest beginnings, arising as an idea in the mind and soul of Oscar Geiger, and coming into being through the interest and effort of the student-group whom he had led into "paths where they no longer grope."

The Henry George Fellowship is his living memorial and its watch-word is—"Let Us Move Forward Together."

As it is developing, the Henry George Fellowship is not an organized body; it is the growing body of alumni of the Henry George School of Social Science wherever classes are formed, a free society, freely entered into for the advancement of a common ideal.

By the new year there should be over one thousand members, and it is proposed to proceed along these lines until the roster is one hundred thousand strong!

HELEN D. DENBIGH.

## Arthur Madsen at International Night Henry George Congress

MR. A. W. MADSEN related the difficulties that his colleague Mr. F. C. R. Douglas (the author of the "Memorandum"), and he met with at Geneva in endeavoring to get the views of the International Union officially accepted by some Government or other, but without success. Yet the document was placed in the hands of every one of the delegates and it had since been translated and circulated in fourteen languages, so that it had far wider notice and certainly very many more readers than anything the Conference itself produced. Since Geneva, with its futile resolution that tariffs had been raised high enough and should not be increased, more and more trade barriers had been erected. Added to the fiscal weapon of customs tariffs they now had the actual physical stoppage of goods by quotas, exchange restrictions and prohibitions. It was the mentality of war and was bringing the world to another Armageddon. As long as tariffs produced revenues, free trade would have the bitter opposition of the financial interests and the occupiers of the "house of have," who consider themselves secure under systems of indirect taxation. Free Traders fought a losing battle who did not see this connection and imagined that protectionist manufacturers were the only interests concerned, whereas the tariff issue was the "blanket code" for loading the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of the working people as a whole. The Governments of the United States Canada and Australia, not to speak of other countries, had contributed savagely to this process of taxing their own citizens to enrich privilege within their own boundaries. But the trade interferences led to reprisals taking the form, such is the madness of it all, of taxes and tribute imposed by other Governments on their own nationals. In Great Britain before the 1931 panic, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, then Labor Prime Minister, had supported the urgent demand for another World Conference to seek the return to sanity. The pretences and insincerities of that time were shown in the result. The new Government in 1931 deliberately surrendered British Free Trade. The protectionists led by Mr. Neville Chamberlain had to get their way. The tariff was imposed, followed by the Ottawa Agreements which were the greatest blunder and greatest crime any Government, of whatever nation, have committed. The world was faced by an accomplished fact. The Economic Conference was repeatedly postponed and when it was held, in 1933, it became a farce which

was rudely hissed off the stage. What Canada had done with its tariff in destroying agriculture and producing despair in the West was illustrated by the mental collapse of a whole people now worshipping the printing press as the distributor of a national dividend. Western Australia, similarly afflicted industrially, but not losing its head, proposes severance from the rest of the Commonwealth if it cannot otherwise enjoy the benefits of freedom to trade.

It was no wonder that with markets closed against them, or treated as the special perquisite of some nations, that countries like Japan Germany and Italy used the language of war in asserting the need for expansion or that, surrounded by the tariff walls they themselves built, they complained of being overpopulated, refusing the produce that the rest of the world could supply in overwhelming abundance.

In Great Britain, the Government called National had not only enforced the tariffs and its many schemes to uphold the rent of land but had also, without a mandate and in betrayal of its pledges, repealed the Land Value Tax and Land Valuation provisions of the first Finance Act of 1931 with its enormous promise for the future. Ministers of the Government in very shame of their action tried to get rid of their legislation in the fewest possible words but the Premier, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, (who had absented himself from all debates), was stung to an explanation by the public protest the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values had made. The letter he wrote in reply unwittingly but completely smashed the conspiracy of silence, for the Committee took care to let it be known through the Press that by virtual admission of the Prime Minister this National Government had simply obeyed the behests of the landed interests. It was the only possible explanation.

In conclusion, Mr. Madsen said it was argued that whether a country had protective tariffs or free imports the condition of the worker would be reduced to the same low level by the stranglehold of land monopoly. That was true in the long run, just as it was true that public education, improved sanitation and all material advance would be absorbed by the privileged receivers of rent under the law as now constituted. It showed how urgent was the land value policy and how essential it was to link that with free trade. But the economic injuries caused by protection were not the least. Far greater was the poisoning of the spirit, the moral corruption and degradation fostering suspicion and hate, making every man's neighbor his enemy, Ishmaelites not only in national spheres but in the everyday affairs of our individual lives.—*Land and Liberty*, London, England.

## Arthur Madsen at Banquet Henry George Congress

MR. MADSEN also conveyed greetings to the Congress, these being in the name of the British movement and in written messages and cables from many parts of the world, from Alaska to Cape Horn, from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa and from nearly all the countries of Europe exceptions being Portugal, Italy, Russia and the Baltic States. When they looked abroad to see what legislative progress had been made and the fellowship existing to promote their ideas they could in truth say that no social reformer had been so justified in his day and generation as Henry George.

In Great Britain, land value taxation was written into the programmes of the Liberal and Labor parties. Briefly sketching the nature of the campaign work conducted by the United Committee and the Leagues with the many agencies at their disposal, he traced Parliamentary history of the movement with its success and setbacks. Most important was what the municipalities had done and were doing in their official capacity, action that had been initiated years back in Glasgow by the pioneer work of Bailie Burt. Mentioning a number of large municipalities that had engaged in this agitation, he pointed to the lead now being given by the Cardiff City

Council which had just held a representative conference of Welsh counties and towns. There was a vast opportunity for organizing the forces that could speak to some purpose and in the wider national sphere as well, insisting on land value taxation as the way to both freedom of production and freedom of trade. He could not help reflecting on the misuse of the phrase *laissez faire* which rightly interpreted meant "let things be done," with all restrictions upon production removed. It was not a negative but a positive policy, a command to landlord, tax-gatherer and bureaucrat alike to get out of the way and give equal freedom a chance. It was another way of saying that the moral law must be observed, reminding him of a thought to which John Paul often recurred, and is the essence of the Henry George philosophy, that our civilization cannot flourish but is doomed if moral progress halts behind material progress. There was all the truth in the injunction of the prophet of old who cried: "Ye people rend your hearts and your garments" when affliction was among them.

So among us, poverty and unemployment prevailed, not through any fatality beyond our control but because of an elemental injustice for which the people themselves were responsible in their laws. Instead of bewailing the circumstances, rending our garments and trying now to make clothes of our tatters (which is what present day Governments are doing) we must fight the wrong and in our hearts assert the right whereby there shall be opportunity in abundance, wealth and happiness in abundance, for all the sons of men.

*Land and Liberty*, London, England.

## Tributes to Henry George

FROM THE ELECTORS OF THE HALL OF FAME  
AND OTHERS

IN this issue (see Comment and Reflection, page 180) will be found a reference to the recent election to the Hall of Fame, in which Henry George received fifty-six votes, five less than required to elect—Hon Edward Polak calls the vote "phenomenal" when it is borne in mind that Henry George received only three votes in 1925.

Mr. Polak was indefatigable in his labors to bring to the attention of the Electors the claims of this great American to a place among the immortals. In this work he had the cooperation of the secretary of the Schalkenbach Foundation, Miss Antoinette Kaufmann, its president Hon. Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, and Mrs. Anna George de Mille. Those who feel some disappointment at the result cannot accuse Mr. Polak and those who cooperated with him of failing to take advantage of the situation. Their work was admirable and unremitting.

The letters received from the Electors as well as the friends who urged upon them the claims of our leader are vastly interesting.

Hon. Josephus Daniels wrote as follows:

"I am giving myself the pleasure of writing to some of my friends to express the hope that the Electors of the Hall of Fame will include the name of Henry George among the great men of the Republic, for he deserves that honor."

Dan Beard, who needs no introduction to Single Tax readers, writes:

"I knew Henry George intimately. We would discuss principles and people, as friends may, but all the time I was talking or listening to him, I felt like standing hat in hand, because I realized that back of the man to whom I was talking, there was something big and great—bigger and greater than the generation in which we lived, understood, or that he himself realized—and that was the soul of the man himself."

Hon. Bennett Champ Clark: "I regard Henry George as a great man." Judge Burke of the Supreme Court of North Dakota said: "I have been an admirer of Henry George nearly all my life." Robert Davis of the *New York Sun* wrote: "Henry George should have been in the Hall of Fame thirty years ago." James Truslow Adams, author of a number of thoughtful books, wrote that he had decided

to vote for Henry George. William Allen White said: "He has meant much in my life and I know that he has stirred millions of men to thinking in terms of social welfare."

William E. Dodd, ambassador to Germany, wrote in a letter to Mrs. Post that when voting time came Henry George's name would be first on his list.

Ellen Glasgow, whose novels are perhaps the most notable of all similar output of our present generation, wrote as follows:

"In my early youth "Progress and Poverty," with its penetrating analysis of social conditions, made an indelible impression upon my memory. I have always regarded Henry George as one of our few important social philosophers. Certainly, he deserves, though he does not need, a place in the building we describe as our Hall of Fame."

Rabbi Wise was most emphatic:

"An American Hall of Fame without Henry George is an absurdity. Henry George was one of the greatest of Americans. He was seer, philosopher, prophet. We ask you not for Henry George's sake but for the sake of truth, to cast your ballot for him as one of those most deserving of inclusion within the Hall of Fame."

Letters were received from Hon. Robert Crosser, Albert Bushnell Hart, Prof. John R. Commons, and many others.

## What They Are Saying

### SIMPLICITY IN TAXATION

Followers of Henry George, at a recent convention here, reported an awakening interest in the teachings of the economist-philosopher, who died thirty-eight years ago.

We do not wish to say anything here that might involve us in an academic argument over the principles of the Single Tax, but merely wish to observe in passing that the harshest critics of the plan, even in the heyday of the prophet who held that land was the true source of all wealth, never denied that it possessed the merit of simplicity and, theoretically at least, of justice.

Who can say as much for our present tax system? It is not one of simplicity but one of vast confusion. And it is not equitable, either in theory or in practice.—*New York World Telegram*.

### WHY THE HOUSING PLAN DOESN'T WORK

"1. The PWA makes a slum clearance allotment.

"2. Agents of the PWA begin quietly to secure options on the needed real estate.

"3. It becomes known that the PWA is taking options.

"4. Land speculators rush into the district and take private options. Lawyers sign contracts with landowners for a percentage of all they can get from the government over a stated minimum.

"5. Land prices go up and the government stops buying.

"6. The slum clearance project is canceled."

—IRVING BRANT, editor *St. Louis Star Times* and prominent housing official.

### EVOLUTION DISPROVED

The final proof that men are not related to monkeys is furnished by the fact that no monkey has ever been found who will go hungry because there are too many coconuts or sleep on damp ground because there are too many trees—*The Minnesota Leader*.

### THE JEWISH TIMES IS DISAPPOINTED

The name of William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania, was added to the galaxy of American immortals perpetuated in the Hall of Fame on the campus of New York University, according to a decision reached by the electors of the Hall of Fame last week, while that of Henry George, another famous Philadelphian, was rejected. William Penn, leader of the admirable Quaker sect which first settled this part of America, probably deserves this honor which has been bestowed upon his memory, but Henry George should, we believe,

deserve it even more. If Penn hadn't settled the Eastern Pennsylvania region, somebody else would have settled it later on. But who besides Henry George would have given to the world a book called, "Progress and Poverty," which was read by, and revolutionized the thinking of millions of people throughout the world on vital social and economic questions, which was translated into nearly every civilized language?—*The Jewish Times*, Philadelphia, Pa.

### HAVE DONE NOTHING TO SOLVE THEIR PROBLEM

Are you patriots, who like butter on your bread, and who enjoy club luncheons and bridge teas—are you surprised that hungry men listen to the promises of Communists or espouse the cause of Socialism? You needn't be. You have done nothing to solve their problem or to make it possible for them to enjoy that economic freedom that is their right—guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States that you defend so feverishly to confirm your boasted Americanism.—NORMA COOLEY in *Tax Facts*.

### WHITE PARASOLS

"White parasols and elephants mad with pride are the fruit of a grant of land." Henry George's quotation seems strangely pertinent somehow, to the Abyssinian situation, even if it can't be tacked onto that shortlived grant to American oil interests. The Abyssinian crisis centers in the ownership and control of land. The whole European problem, with whose solution the world's statesmen are now struggling, is at bottom a land problem.

—Winstead (Conn.) *Evening Citizen*.

### COL. HARLEE IS OUTSPOKEN

Our people once rebelled, in 1832, against the plan of imposing import taxes for the general public to pay to enable the lords of manufacturing industries to prosper at their expense, and nullified such laws and prepared to fight to prevent their operation. The prosperity of the lords of industry produced by the perversion of government to create monopolies for them has never spread to those who labored and produced the wealth, and never will. That kind of prosperity for the privileged few exploiters of labor has brought us to our present plight.

—COL. WM. C. HARLEE in his platform for U. S. Senator from South Carolina.

### MANY DOUBTFUL EXPERIMENTS

First we must face the fact that our country is now involved in a vast number of doubtful experiments. Granting that some of these experiments may succeed, it has become evident that many of them contradict laws that are as unchangeable as the law of gravitation and therefore must fail, for man cannot repeal the laws of nature nor of nature's God.—*Investor American*, Chicago, Ill.

### HALTING IMPROVEMENTS

The hopeless abandonment of the original low-rent housing project in South Boston by the Federal Government is an eloquent example of the ruthless and anti-social character of private landlordism. A few selfish individuals squatting with their title deeds on certain small and comparatively insignificant parcels of the earth's surface which at best they can encumber with their unambitious bodies only a few brief years, are permitted by an unintelligent land policy to balk an improvement that would provide decent living conditions to many who sadly need them and which would enrich the lives of thousands of workers and producers in the creation of the proposed structures. All of Boston and its suburbs would have profited by this government enterprise.—FRANKLIN WENTWORTH in Wellesley, Mass, *Townsmen*.

SHOW your friend a copy of LAND AND FREEDOM.



## Where the Wealth Goes

OUT near the rim of Chicago on an unimportant street, ten miles from the City Hall, stands a drug store, on a plot of land that much less than forty years ago was farm land, miles from the city boundaries, valued at a few hundred dollars an acre. The plot of land on which this drug store stands was purchased not many years ago for \$77,000. The present owner now values it at \$90,000. That extra \$20,000 is *unearned increment* just as was the *original \$77,000* for the bare opportunity. The present owner however, paid \$77,000 cash for it and of course he calls it *capital value* and he wants *interest on his investment*. He has had three tenants to date and they all *went broke* and moved out. They could not make the rent and live also; so they quit. The owner then moved into the store and now runs it, both as landowner and business man and while it is safe to say that he will not move out as did the others because he cannot pay the rent, he will charge all the traffic will bear and that is of course all of the cream, all of the skimmed milk, and part of the whey; the balance will go to the customers, as usual. That is the process of division that goes on here and over most of the world. Now what was it the owner invested in when he bought that land? He could not earn that sum in raising garden truck on that land in two hundred years and live well in addition. What he invested in—without knowing it, in all probability—was \$77,000 worth of *tribute levying power*. Now just multiply that sum by the billions of square feet of land of equal area inside of that ten mile radius in three directions from the City Hall and make all the necessary deductions you please and you will still have left a sum of *ciphers backed by the law*, that staggers the imagination; a sum that the average human mind cannot possibly grasp.

Consider carefully the fact that that value is *land value*, that it is social value capitalized against the very people who have to pay interest on it and that this value can be expanded indefinitely. This value does not represent wages paid for work done. Nor does it represent interest paid on useful productive capital. It represents nothing whatever but the legal power to take wealth from industry without giving any wealth or service in return. Consider also that drugs and sundries are made by labor and not by law. Consider also that land value is made by law and not by labor and that were it not for the law's protection that land would not be worth seventy-seven cents and that if the law were abolished, the things made by labor would probably cost fifty or a hundred times more in terms of dollars than they do now and you will begin to see the *economic cavern* into which our local wealth pours in increasing and unceasing volume.

Here is the mammoth cave that with constant regularity and unvarying voracity absorbs labor's earnings,

and that the diameter and depth of this cave can be expanded and it will be always expanded as our wealth producing power increases. We, as a people, have reached a period in our economic history when we will have to take account of these facts and facts they certainly are. That \$77,000 purchase price for a little dinky lot ten miles from City Hall is more than twice as much as the city fathers sold the children's mile square of land for, School section No. 16—in *down town Chicago* 99 years ago. *Some fathers*, don't you think? And the rental of one little lot under the Rookery Building downtown returns in land rental alone every year a thousand dollars more than the Children got for the whole square mile just 99 years ago. Here is the real reason, the true reason why we are today a bankrupt municipality. The real bankruptcy is lack of information on immensely important questions. A bankruptcy that extends from Boston to San Francisco and includes them both. A bankruptcy that has involved the Federal government in five and a half billions of debt is less than two years. A system that mortgages the taxing powers of government years and years in advance to pay the expenses of government in the present and that in a country whose people are never tired of boasting of their wealth and wealth producing power. If this does not imply economic lunacy, the term lunacy has no meaning. It is only too obvious to any thinking citizen that the system is now operating as its own grave-digger. All false systems eventually do that and ours is rapidly following the sorry procession toward the cemetery which contains the gravestone of every fake system from the beginning of time down to the present moment.

To have permanency, a system must be just and it would be almost impossible to find a system or method that contains a greater sum of injustice than the one now operating in this country. That is why it is failing, and the compelling evidence of its failure is piling up mountain high, as the stores empty, the factories shut down, and the bread lines lengthen all over the land. Never in the history of man has such a spectacle been witnessed as can be seen in every center of population in this country. Deepening poverty and steadily increasing wealth producing power; the baldest and most irreconcilable contradiction imaginable. There is nothing in fiction like it. It is the riddle of the sphinx, which not to answer is to be destroyed, nor can the answer be much longer delayed. This system has not only undermined the prosperity and security of our workers, it is now relentlessly at work digging caverns under our prosperous classes who but a short time ago were preening their feathers and hugging no end of delusions as to the continuous upward swing of unparalleled inflation and thought they were wealthy and secure for all time. What has happened in two and a half years has abolished a national security, destroyed smugness, messed up many

great reputations for wisdom. Broken no end of idols, replaced security with alarm, filled kitchens with crusts and made simpletons of statesmen all over the world, and that is just as it should be and will be until we do some straight thinking on the subject of political economy.—HENRY H. HARDINGE.

AT a time when the "Three Estates" were the recognized groups of the French nation, Rochambeau wrote that in reality there were but two, "the privileged people and the unprivileged."

## BOOK REVIEWS

### CHAINING THE WAR GOD\*

Victor Alexander Rule has written a good book. He could have written a great book. A good book is characterized by a presentation that is interesting and entertaining. To be a great book it must be that and something more; it must carry such conviction that its theme acquires inevitability in the mind of the reader. In a book advocating change in the political or social order—propagandist in purpose—the measure of its greatness is the extent to which it convinces the reader as to the efficacy and justice of the reform proposed, and therefore stimulates a desire to see it put into practice.

It is because the subject of war as a denial of natural economic law has never, to my knowledge, been adequately presented; it is because I know that Col. Rule is capable of such a presentation that I choose to measure his book by the more difficult yardstick of greatness, rather than the moderate measure of goodness. And it is my sincere hope that he will follow this first volume, which should gain favor with all lovers of peace, with one in which the attack upon the fundamental cause of all wars—exploitation—is developed in such a way as to leave no doubt even in the minds of militarists that this, and this only, is the cause of war.

To every Georgeist the logic of this book is convincing. To one who is not familiar with Georgeist philosophy I am afraid the development of Col. Rule's thesis will not be so apparent. The syllogism does not seem to be carried out to a finality that resists refutation, and I believe this is due first, to the form of presentation, and secondly, the failure to prove the theory of "surplus wealth," its cause and its effects.

The form followed by the author is to analyze the proximate causes of war—the machinations of diplomats, the avarice of munition makers, the irritation of large armies and navies—and to show how none of these of themselves bring about armed conflicts. He discounts very ably the theory of population pressure as a cause of war. He sketches the various attempts to achieve universal peace and shows how and why they failed in their purpose and in fact often were the irritants that hastened the advent of wars. Thus, clearing away the obvious causes for war and the inadequacy of the popularly accepted devices for eliminating war (in ten chapters), he proceeds in two chapters to tell how the War God can be chained. The first of these chapters is entitled "With What Do Nations Fight?," and the answer is "credit." He advocates a tax on land value not only as a means for reducing national debt, but also as a deterrent to the patriot-landlords who clamor for, and profit from, war, but are not willing to pay for it. The next chapter, "For What Do Nations Fight?" reveals what he considers the fundamental cause of war—"surplus wealth" seeking profitable investment in the exploitation of subject peoples. (In this chapter Col. Rule indulges, for no good

reason at all, the obsession he shares with several Chicago Single Taxers, namely, that rent is expressed in price!) Then he devotes a chapter to showing that this "surplus wealth" is derived from land rent, and that the way to destroy this urge toward imperialistic enterprise is to socialize the rent of land. A short chapter on "What If War Should Come" serves only to bring out that the socialization of land rent would enrich our national coffers immensely for fighting purposes, and by removing the cause of poverty would develop a greater fighting morale in the citizens; but it naturally occurs that if the cure for war has been proven, why speculate on the possibility of war after the cure has been applied, unless, indeed, the author is not quite sure of himself?

Such, in brief, is the form of argument used in the book. It is through a process of elimination of other causes and cures that Col. Rule attempts to lead the reader to his (Rule's) conclusion. It is plausible inference, but not wholly convincing. There seems to be a hiatus in the reasoning. Might not another author, believing that wars arise from some innate desire of man to fight, a sort of sadistic propensity of the human being, continue the process of elimination and just as plausibly eliminate the "surplus wealth" theory as well? Might not another author, accepting this theory, advocate the abolition by law of foreign investments as a means of stopping war? Indeed, Col. Rule does not explain why there were wars before there were foreign investments. What foreign investments did the Romans have in Gaul when Caesar led his legions over the Alps? And how does the "surplus wealth" theory explain our own Indian wars? "Chaining the War God" does not prove its case.

"Surplus wealth"—an expression that is quite descriptive, but somewhat abhorrent to me because borrowed from socialistic phraseology—is that part of wealth produced by capital and labor which is diverted from their rightful owners to the pockets of landowners. This diversion is possible because of the monopoly of land. Were land free, that is, if its accessibility were open to all on equal terms, this wealth would naturally flow to its rightful owners, labor and capital. The freeing of the land from private ownership is to be attained by socialization of rent. In this way the wealth of which labor and capital is robbed, and which is far in excess of the personal requirements of landowners, would not accumulate in the hands of a few, who find it necessary to invest it in further exploitation. Finding their home markets glutted because of the citizens' inability to consume more goods—due to the very robbing of them by the landlords—foreign markets are sought for the investment of this "surplus wealth." In these foreign markets, however, these investments come in conflict with the loot of landlords from other countries also seeking fields for exploitation. The struggle for markets then becomes an irritant which results in armed conflict. The way to eliminate a troublesome competitor is to secure a monopoly. With a large army and navy you simply prevent him by brute force from entering your field; if he also has an army and navy, a fight ensues.

While Col. Rule does explain this source of "surplus wealth" (and the land-value-tax method of destroying it), he does not, it seems to me, convincingly show that its search for foreign fields of investment is the primary cause of wars. Nor does he give sufficient emphasis to the idea that the abolition of poverty, through the elimination of land speculation, would create a social condition repulsive to the idea of war. The militarist would find the self-satisfied citizen, with lots to live for, quite unresponsive to his appeal to commit murder, and to subject himself to the same possibility.

The absence of any reference to tariff walls as a cause of war is a rather unexpected omission in this book. Germany, a manufacturing nation in the main, found itself unable to market its products in other countries because of "protective tariffs, and therefore sought outlets in Africa, Asia and South America. Then it came into conflict with the agents of "surplus wealth" from England and France. Its "place in the sun" denied it, Germany went to war. It is true that tariffs are another expression or creation of "surplus wealth,"

\*Chaining the War God by Col. Victor A. Rule. Cloth, 12 mo., 306 pp. Price \$2.25. James A. Bell, Elkhart, Ind., Publisher.

but as a proximate irritant of war this stoppage of the free exchange of wealth is too manifest to be entirely ignored in a book on this subject. As a matter of record, the Civil War between the American states was caused primarily by the economic antagonism of the "free trade" South and the "protected" North.

Col. Rule's book, valuable as it is, leaves something undone. The world needs to be shown, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, that poverty is the real cause of war, and that the abolition of poverty is the only cure, that the urge to escape from conditions of poverty is the force which directs peoples' eyes, and those of their rulers, to other peoples' lands.

Proceeding from the economic axiom that man seeks to satisfy his desires with the least amount of effort, and that war is the exertion of utmost effort, the subject of war could be treated in such a way as to show why this contradiction manifests itself. The reason can be found in the attempt to frustrate the operation of natural economic law. Having arrived at this first premise, the scientific approach would be to apply this premise to the test by analyzing the causes of, and conditions precedent to, a number of major wars throughout history. Thus our premise of the economic cause of war would be proven by logic and by example.

Such an approach to the subject of war, by one endowed with research ability and the power of logical expression, would be a valuable contribution to the Georgist philosophy, as well as to the literature of the peace movement. It is needed.

Col. Rule's "Chaining the War God" is a good book. Every student of Henry George should read it. A familiarity with this book will help us to demonstrate to the constantly increasing number of peace advocates that in our philosophy alone can they find the real answer to their prayers. It is as good propaganda for Single Tax as it is for peace, and it is very interestingly written, in the oratorical style of which the author is a master.—FRANK CHODOROV.

#### OUR ENEMY, THE STATE\*

Now and then a thinker breaks through the yearly billions of printed words with real thoughts ably expressed and logically presented. Such a book is "Our Enemy, The State," by Albert Jay Nock. To read it is to feel like a traveller lost on a dark road and a bright flash of lightning shows him where he is—where he is going.

Nock distinguishes government from The State, as he does religion from the organized church. He treats the historical developments of the power of the State and its present increasing power. The book traces in detail government and The State in America from the earliest colonial days through the American Revolution with its ideals of a free people—a true democracy—and shows that with the increasing power of the State man even in the United States seems made for the State instead of the State for man. How true that was in the World War when men were conscripted, but not property!

The State, Nock shows, obtaining too much power becomes a parasitic growth, feeding on civilization and destroying the social consciousness and the self reliance of the people. He condemns the State "lock, stock and barrel."

Nock wants the citizen to look very closely into the institution of the State. He wants him to ask how the State originated and why, and what is the State's primary function, and then to decide whether by the testimony of history the State is to be regarded in essence as a social or anti-social institution. He presents the Single Tax theory as a perfect solution of our economic problems, and a solution that still leaves men free from the juggernaut of the State.

Under the Roosevelt administration, faced by the present emergency, the centralized government, Nock shows, has grown by leaps and bounds, the government more and more wiping out State lines, piling up the public debt, taking larger and larger parts of the people's income to support its horde of agents. He shows the centralized

State, by what is called a planned economy, creating a scarcity of production, raising the cost of living artificially—while millions cannot pay the present price of food and clothing and shelter.

Nock points out that when the disastrous Johnstown flood occurred socialized power was immediately mobilized and applied with intelligence and vigor. That a beggar now usually asks in vain for a handout. In both instances of a large or small catastrophe, we all almost instinctively now say "let the government do it." The government does—at great expense, inefficiently, and with an added number to its cohorts, which like the seven-year locusts eat up the harvests of the land.

The other day I was in the country and the long drought had dried up most of the wells and springs of the countryside. On the main road was a perpetual spring that some one years ago had built a wall around to protect it. Many people were getting their water from it. Over the spring were some boards that had rotted. I said, "Let's get some boards to cover the spring properly and keep the dust and leaves out." Someone replied: "Let the town do it." Yes, let the town do it. Call it to the attention of the Town Council to go through the red tape to get a board, to get a man to go with a car, to cover the spring—all at the community's expense and increased taxes.

The author points out that outside of poorhouses and hospitals and such institutional enterprises—destitution and unemployment were usually relieved by what he calls the "social power" of the people. He then states:

"Under Mr. Roosevelt, however, the State assumed this function, publicly announcing the doctrine, brand-new in our history, that the State owes its citizens a living. Students of politics, of course, saw in this merely an astute proposal for a prodigious enhancement of State power."

This is not exactly true or fair in my opinion, and nowhere does Nock point out that Roosevelt was faced with a depression and tremendous unemployment, with millions of men and women ready, able and willing to work and unable to find work. Roosevelt, *not* knowing the remedy for unemployment and the depression, and in order to prevent a revolution, chose the "dole," work-relief, N.R.A., depreciated money and plowing under cotton and pig killing and cutting down production in various ways to raise prices. I believe Roosevelt's fear was not a groundless fear. Millions would not starve peacefully in a land of plenty. Was it the town of English, out west where farmers threatened to take food by force if not fed? No greater surprise to the American people could have happened. I further doubt that all these steps of grasping power was deliberate and intentional, though Roosevelt was glad to have billions of dollars to spend, which incidentally helped build up his political machine.

Nock says:

"Practically all the sovereign rights and powers of the smaller political units—all of them that are significant enough to be worth absorbing—have been absorbed by the federal unit; nor is this all. State power has not only been thus concentrated at Washington, but it has been so far concentrated into the hands of the Executive that the existing regime is a regime of personal government."

He then adds:

"This regime was established by a coup d'etat of a new and unusual kind, practicable only in a rich country. It was effected not by violence, like Louis-Napoleon's, or by terrorism, like Mussolini's, but by purchase."

If increasing prosperity should come, and the wheels of industry really begin to revolve, and the work be available more generally, I believe the revolt of the tax payer, aided by the press, will cut down a goodly portion of this conversion of social power into State power, even though Nock believes we are "a people little gifted with intellectual integrity."

He further believes that:

"The method of direct subsidy, or sheer cash-purchase, will therefore in all probability soon give way to the indirect method of what is called "social legislation;" that is, a multiplex system of State-managed pensions, insurance and indemnities of various kinds."

\*By Albert Jay Nock. 12 mo. Clo. 209 pp. Price \$2.25. William Morrow & Co., N. Y. City.

and believing that we are moving toward the collectivist's aim of complete extinction of social power through absorption by the State, he says:

"It may be in place to remark here the essential identity of the various extant forms of collectivism. The superficial distinctions of Fascism, Bolshevism, Hitlerism, are the concern of journalists and publicists; the serious student sees in them only the one root-idea of a complete conversion of social power into State power."

The author bitterly opposes the government taking over public utilities and other public monopolies, or any other industries, as he sees the centralized government "managing them with ever increasing corruption, inefficiency and prodigality, and finally resorting to a system of forced labor." I personally believe that under the *present* system public utilities cannot be properly regulated, as they control the government. The citizen is on the horns of a dilemma of choosing to be exploited on the one hand by public utilities and being governed by them in addition, or allowing the State to own and operate them.

Nock, as stated before, carefully distinguishes the State from government; showing one being based on force and theft, and the other based on the consent of the governed; the State being an instrument for exploitation of one class by another, and government being an instrument for the protection of liberty and security and justice between individuals. He carefully shows that from the earliest days of history conquerors always confiscated the land and natural resources, compelling the conquered to pay tribute. That only the assumption of the justice of things as they are, aided by the school system, the press and the churches, prevent the people from examining the right of those who by conquest or theft parcelled out the land, and continue to levy tribute on those who wish to use it. He shows that William the Conqueror invaded England and divided its land among his followers. He shows that the foul factory system of England—and incidentally ours—could not have grown up except that the people had been denied access to the land. He shows how the Indians in America were wiser than we are in the use of the land.

One of the fundamental reasons for the American Revolution, Nock contends, was the desire on the part of many of the leading colonists to obtain access to the vast land of the west, England having in 1736 forbade the colonists to take up land lying westward of the source of any river flowing through the Atlantic seaboard. He makes clear that "land speculation may be put down as the first major industry established in Colonial America." He shows the ideal of the Declaration of Independence and Thomas Jefferson for a free people with free access to the land.

Our author believes, pointing the Single Tax remedy, that "Our Enemy the State," can be shorn of its power, until it is merely a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." He gives enough of the Henry George theory so that those who have the intelligence can understand, and those who desire the full argument on behalf of the Single Tax are pointed to "Progress and Poverty" for study. He succinctly states:

"The first postulate of fundamental economics is that man is a land-animal, deriving his subsistence wholly from land. His entire wealth is produced by the application of labor and capital to land; no form of wealth known to man can be produced in any other way. Hence, if his free access to land be shut off by legal preemption, he can apply his labor and capital only with the landholder's consent, and on the landholder's terms; in other words, it is at this point, and this point only, that exploitation becomes practicable."

and bitingly holds:

"it is interesting to observe that although all our public policies would seem to be in process of exhaustive review, no publicist has anything to say about the State system of land-tenure. This is no doubt the best evidence of its importance."

Nock, of course, believes in free trade. He says of tariffs:

"We all know pretty well, probably, that the primary reason for a tariff is that it enables the exploitation of the domestic consumer by a process indistinguishable from sheer robbery."

Though he adds in a footnote:

"It must be observed, however, that free trade is impracticable so long as land is kept out of free competition with industry in the labor-market."

He does not sufficiently show to one unfamiliar with the Single Tax theory, how society by taking the economic rent would simplify the government and do away with hordes of government officials. A fuller discussion of that, with a few examples of how the Single Tax would eliminate tens of thousands of custom officials, income tax investigators, etc., and the present horde of bureaucrats who are helping the unemployed (sic), would have made it clearer to the uninitiated reader.

Nock pleads for the small subdivisions of government where each citizen can take part, and learn self-reliance and the pride of citizenship by actually solving local problems—rather than having a centralized bureau dominate, control and possibly enslave. He explains the continuance of our present system as follows:

"The persistence of our unstable and iniquitous economic system is not due to the power of accumulated capital, the force of propaganda, or to any force or combination of forces commonly alleged as its cause. It is due solely to a certain set of terms in which men think of the opportunity to work; they regard this opportunity as something to be given. Nowhere is there any other idea about it than that the opportunity to apply labor and capital to natural resources for the production of wealth is not in any sense a right but a concession. This is all that keeps our system alive. When men cease to think in those terms, the system will disappear, and not before."

The future is not as dark as Nock sees it—and his book put into the hands of 10,000 editors and teachers of the country, thinking business and professional men, might help stave off the coming despotism. This book in the hands of one man—Franklin D. Roosevelt—and studied and understood by him—would stop the growing bureaucracy, for while Roosevelt is a politician and wants re-election (I believe his motives are sincere) his understanding of the way out of the depression is darkened by too much counsel, by a "brain trust," which now more clearly is seen to be what I called it, almost two years ago, "brain dust."

This book if carefully read by those with intelligence will be found as startling and as devastating as the establishment of the fact that the world was round or of Newton's law of gravitation.

Men of America, I believe, are still lovers of liberty—though in desperation to find an economic solution of the depression they may have acquiesced or submitted to experiments economic and governmental, along the road of State despotism. The men and women of America, will not, I believe, sell their birthright of liberty for a mess of pottage.—HARRY WEINBERGER, of the New York Bar.

## Correspondence

FROM THE SON OF JUDGE ROBERT MINOR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. E. P. Haye tells me that you have asked for an outline of the life of my father, Robert Berkeley Minor, who died here June 19, 1935, in his eighty-fourth year. His last illness interrupted his twenty-third year as judge of the 57th District Court of Texas, and a half century of earnest effort on behalf of the Single Tax movement. Manuscripts found among his papers give evidence of his repeated attempts to secure legislation enacting its principles.

This is written in his library, and round about are many volumes of Henry George. All are worn and thumb marked. One, of "Progress and Poverty," became so tattered in use that it required re-binding to preserve the copious notes and marginal references his interest inspired. From the edges of them all hang the straggly ends of page markers—grocery store string—marking his favorite passages. I believe you will understand as I did what he meant when he whispered, rather wistfully, just before he died, "There is so much to do—so much."

He was born in the ancestral home, Edgewood, Hanover County, in the James River country of Virginia, in 1851. The great cry for enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law sounded from the North in that year and grew to a rumble of gunfire during his "conditioning years." In the sudden joining of battle at Chancellorsville his older brothers, soldiers in the Confederacy, dug a hole in the ground and sat him in it when he was caught there as a messenger boy of twelve, come to bring them fresh meat. His and his family's hatred of the institution of slavery was equalled only by their devotion to the cause of the States' right to settlement of their own problems.

The Reconstruction, striking desolation upon his people and hopelessness upon his youthful spirit, set him off to the new frontier, Texas, in 1878. He taught a school for boys near San Antonio for several years, then came here as clerk in the Maverick Land Office. The old files of that institution are mines of color in stories of that and earlier periods of Texas history, when the vast domain of the cattleman and sheep rancher was disputed by the first dirt farmers. Strangely intercurrent just here, there came to his attention at this time some reflections by a San Francisco newspaper writer on "Our Land and Land Policy." Little from this Western writer's pen escaped him thereafter.

With a background of courses in Latin and Greek, in Engineering and in Law in the University of Virginia, my father chose the latter and was admitted to the bar in 1886. He became a stout champion of the United Labor Party led by Henry George in far away New York in that year. He never lost this enthusiasm. Ever cautious against fanaticism he would tear at the Georgian preachments ruthlessly, testing, weighing, seeking conflicts with its enemies, always strengthening his convictions—and winning converts.

He was elected City Attorney of San Antonio in the nineties, returned to private practice at the turn of the century, headed the state board that codified the jumbled laws of Texas in 1910, and in 1912 was elected to the judgeship he gave up in death.

San Antonio, Texas.

JOE H. MINOR.

### THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The California campaign is warming up rather rapidly even though the election is nearly a year away. Our enemies are unmasking their batteries. Coming into the open we have against us the State Chamber of Commerce, State Board of Equalization (controlling among other matters the administration of the sales tax), the various Real Estate Boards and some farm organization officials.

On the other hand we find an apparently united body of labor organizations, all leading bodies being unanimously committed to our measure, earnest and intelligent support from the entire number of Labor papers, some twenty or more, scattered newspaper support in addition, as well as the aid of certainly a big percentage of the Epic group.

We have virtually three regular offices in the State, the center of work. In San Francisco Mr. Noah D. Alper is in charge at 83 McAllister Street; in Los Angeles, Franklin Lowney at Philharmonic Building, and in San Diego, E. M. Stangland at 2660 National Avenue. These are the centers of distribution of all our literature.

It seems appropriate that the first wide struggle for the attainment of a large share of the ideas of Henry George should be the State which first saw his great production. For all the prior attempts or successes have been on a small scale or did not involve sufficient revenues to signify all that we would have them mean. Here, however, we have five per cent of the people of the United States and our measure, taking taxation off tangible personal property and improvements, involves a shift of not far from one hundred fifty millions in taxes and a contribution to the State and its subordinate jurisdictions of fifty to sixty per cent of the economic rental value.

This measure will be fought with all the virulence which would have greeted an attempt to make a complete transfer of all other

taxes to land values, and the question arises why should not therefore the fight have been made for the whole rental value. The answer is easy. We can only succeed by the votes of those who are willing to join us. To them we have proof to make. They would not have been willing to go the whole distance. They apparently were and are willing to carry into effect the present undertaking. We are in a war, which must be fought much as would be a military campaign. We can remind ourselves of the words of General N. B. Forrest, who is quoted as saying that the whole art of war was "to get there fustest with the mostest men." If with an appeal to the majority we can get half way today we can leave the future to take care of itself. If our plan of reform is correct it will justify itself so that there will be no fear of a backward step.

Will we succeed in the present campaign? I can assure you the California fight will not be ended till we do win. As for the present, our greatest hopes are founded upon the panicky fears of our opponents, who realize the strength of our call upon the public. The papers of the State fifty times over have disclosed this attitude.

The greatest restriction upon our activity is found in the want of money. While our opponents have a right to make demands upon the longest pocketbooks in the State we work with relatively almost nothing. Our friends in the State supply half of what should be our minimum necessities. We have received of late appreciated and increasing sums from scattered friends throughout the United States, but vastly too little for our real needs.

We cannot say too strongly that the fight we are making is the fight of the whole United States, and that all contributors are helping themselves and even their children's children.

Finally I am glad to note that Mrs. Anna George De Mille is now in Los Angeles, and will shortly aid us in San Francisco. We count greatly upon her assistance especially with the Women's Clubs. May we hope that all friends will consider California for their next vacation ground and help us by their presence and money!

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

### SOCIALISTS HELP IN READING, PA.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In presuming to make suggestions about Single Tax progress I am somewhat influenced by an unusual experience: The City of Reading, Pa., now systematically assesses real estate with separate land and improvement values, which is essential to the applying of Single Tax. The movement was started by the Reading Chamber of Commerce, in expectation of the so-called Pittsburgh law being extended to third class cities in Pennsylvania. The Chamber bore the expense of making sample appraisements of eight city blocks and employed the Manufacturer's Appraisal Co.; the different foot-frontage values, however, being determined by public meetings. These appraisements were made use of by succeeding Republican and Democratic city administrations, but they were not extended to the whole city as hoped for;—until a Socialist administration came in and immediately employed the same Manufacturer's Appraisal Co. in applying the Somer's system to the entire city. This was done after a friendly conference with our Chamber of Commerce Tax Committee.

How did this happen,—with Socialists notoriously unfriendly to Chambers of Commerce and distrustful of all their doings? Simply because Socialist leaders were convinced, by investigation, that it was a movement in good faith in a direction they wanted to go,—and they carried it through. I was Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee and Single Tax was freely talked at this conference. Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART.

### WE DO NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am delighted to find Frank Chodorov saying in your last issue that such reform as Abolition are based entirely upon sentiment and that their advocates have nothing to teach. This is correct; and it

applies as well to Prohibition, the Townsend Pension Plan, EPIC, Father Coughlin's drive for Social Justice, Huey Long's share-the-wealth movement, etc.

I was sorry, however, to see that Chodorov also said that the followers of Henry George "must eventually enter the political arena."

The two positions are inconsistent, particularly in view of his statement in the preceding paragraph that what has been holding up the Georgeist movement is the misunderstanding of those who ignorantly believe that landlordism is a beneficial system and that attacks upon it are attacks upon our security.

He is correct, of course, in saying that it is this lack of understanding that has brought it about that the selfishness of men has so stubbornly blocked our path; but why can he not see that, if properly instructed, these same selfish people would be just as selfishly stubborn in support of the Georgeist plan? What he says about the people's lack of understanding in this matter is merely another way of saying that, if instructed, their instinct of self-preservation would be enlisted on our side.

Upon his own testimony, therefore, I insist that we would be disloyal to the Georgeist cause to take time out from our teaching to take any part in the political arena. That is not our place. Rather is it our place to teach, teach, teach—thereby to loosen the avalanche of instinctive self-preservative activity on the part of the people that will carry our cause to victory. Any selfish ignoramus can do the necessary political work; but we Georgeists must do the teaching.

Teach, teach! Let instinct do the rest!

Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

#### A LETTER TO BOLTON HALL

DEAR MR. HALL:

Mr. Villard, who has had to leave for the West, has asked me to say that he has read the extract from LAND AND FREEDOM which you sent to him. He wishes you to know that he has not been responsible for any articles or editorials that have appeared in *The Nation* for the last three years, he having laid down the editorship that long ago. The fastening of the responsibility upon him in this article is therefore entirely unjust.

MAUDE L. KIMBERELY,  
Secretary to Oswald Garrison Villard.

#### SOMETHING MORE ABOUT LEVESON GOWER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I was very much intrigued by the item in last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM about Morris Van Veen's purchase of a copy of "Progress and Poverty" containing a review of the book from the *London Times* of September 14, 1882. It sent me scurrying on one of my private pastimes, namely, looking up data in the library.

The review in the *Times* covers four columns and is unsigned, as are all reviews in the *Times* to this day, excepting the *Weekly News Supplement*.

I doubt very much whether Leveson Gower (pronounced Lawson-Gore) wrote it. He belonged to the family of the Duke of Sutherland who were never particularly enthusiastic about land reform of any sort, particularly George's doctrine.

But Lady Dorothy Nevill in her Reminiscences refers to him as a "gentle radical" though he was an aristocrat by birth and training. He often had Gladstone as a guest at his home.

Having a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in his possession stamps him, I should say, as a student of political questions. He did not always see eye to eye with his landowning relatives and may have leaned to the Single Tax theory.

This does not make the question of authorship any clearer, but I was glad of the chance to dig up this much.

N. Y. City

MAURICE FIRTH.

#### EDMUND P. DONOVAN THROWS FURTHER LIGHT ON THE QUESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am pleased to try and throw a little light on the query raised in the current number of LAND AND FREEDOM, regarding the copy of "Progress and Poverty" purchased by Mr. Van Veen.

The owner of the book, the Hon. Frederick Leveson Gower, was a son of Sir George Leveson Gower. I do not think, however, that he was responsible for the review preserved from the *London Times* which Mr. Van Veen found in the book. It is quite possible that his son who was Private Secretary to William Ewert Gladstone, from 1880 to 1885, while Gladstone was Prime Minister, afterwards representing Northwest Staffordshire as liberal member of Parliament, and was also European Editor of the *North American Review* in England from 1899 to 1908, was author of the review in question.

It is also interesting to note that another Leveson Gower was closely associated with Gladstone in his Cabinet. This was George Leveson Gower, Second Earl of Granville, who was Under Secretary for Affairs in Lord Melbourne's Ministry and prominent free trade leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords in 1855, and leader of the opposition after the Gladstone Ministry was defeated. He was Colonial Secretary in the First Gladstone Ministry in 1868, Foreign Secretary in 1870 and 1880-1885. He supported Gladstone on the Home Rule Question in 1886. This branch of the family were always active supporters of the Liberal Party in England at that time, and should not be confused with another branch of the family of the Duchy of Sutherland,—one member, Frederick Nevill Sutherland Leveson Gower, who sat as Liberal Unionist Member for Sutherland from 1900-1906, the Liberal Unionists, as you know, being that branch of the conservative party which split when Joseph Chamberlain first advocated his protectionist policy of Tariff Reform.

I trust you will find this information useful.

N. Y. City.

EDMUND P. DONOVAN.

#### THERE WAS A MAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I will remember Frank Stephens who died June 16, 1935, not as an economist, not as a fighter for economic justice, not as a writer, not as an orator, but as a fearless soul, a believer in liberty and an opponent of war who wrote a great letter that should be as famous as Nathan Hale's "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Frank Stephens and his son Donald, who were pacifists and opposed the World War, walked in to the White House the day after Mr. Wilson went before Congress and asked for a Declaration of War, and delivered the letter to Assistant Secretary Foster to be delivered to the President.

The letter reads as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT:

The bloodguilt of this war is upon you and neither you nor the law shall make me a sharer in it. I will neither kill nor help kill.

When it seems expedient to you, as it soon must, to make an example by punishment of those who will not obey your war laws and who appeal to others not to obey them I offer myself for that service to my country.—FRANK STEPHENS.

Nathan Hale may have been sorry he had but one life to lose for his country. He had no choice but to lose it, but greater than that was this courageous act of Frank Stephens.

During the war he was indicted under the Espionage Law for giving reasons for refusing to buy liberty bonds and after a trial was acquitted. Donald Stephens spent nine months in jail as a pacifist who refused to be registered and drafted.

Father and son—they opposed war in the time of war, when governments, people and the press were insane on the subject.

Frank Stephens never weighed his opinions by the tides of time, or the opinions of friends. There was a man.

N. Y. City.

HARRY WEINBERGER.

## PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

The Economic League of Ohio has reprinted in neat pamphlet form the report of the special committee of the American Institute of Architects in 1932. Of this committee W. R. B. Wilcox was chairman. The title of the pamphlet is "Why Penalize Building?"

Ohio bobs up again with a pamphlet from Peter Witt of Cleveland, "How Economic Ignorance Causes Depressions." It comprises sixteen pages and is sold for ten cents a copy. Those who know Peter Witt will know that the job is well done.

Two other pamphlets need to be noticed. Both hail this time from Pittsburgh. "The McNair Five to One Plan" and "The Economics of Henry George" from the pen of John C. Rose. The first named is dedicated to the memory of Francis W. Maguire and the price is ten cents per copy.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

"Land and Freedom," by Frederick Verinder, London, England.  
 "Land and Unemployment," by James F. Muirhead, M. A. L. H. D.  
 "Abram S. Hewitt," by Allan Nevins.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

MRS. EMILY E. F. SKEEL writes us: "Your last issue was a feast. I wonder afresh how you get such a meaty and salty meal on a topic with which we are all so familiar. Your readers are to be congratulated." Will Lissner of the *New York Times* also comments as follows: "By the way the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM is particularly good."

A RECENT article in the *New York Sun* gives an interesting account of the life and achievements of Bolton Hall. It is flippant enough to attract the attention of the casual newspaper reader but we will not quarrel about it.

ONE of the New York tabloids, the *Daily Mirror* of Oct. 1, contained an editorial on Henry George in which the writer says: "Some day George's hope will be realized, all men will own the earth." Then in an amateurish way the writer wanders off the reservation with the following: "But first they must own themselves and they must control themselves and they must think for themselves." May we not point out to the *Mirror* that no man can own himself when that from which he must derive his sustenance, the earth, is owned by others.

A SUBSCRIBER in Middletown, N. Y., desires the source of the quotation: "The stairway of history continually resounds with wooden sabots going up and silken sandals coming down."

HON. EUGENE TALMADGE, governor of Georgia, writes to Harold Sudell of Brookline, Pa.: "Your letter to the *Philadelphia Ledger* is good and contains some food for thought."

ANTONIO BASTIDA has returned from Cuba and is now living in Los Angeles.

ROBERT L. McCAIG of Erie, Mich., is interested, as some of our readers know, in a portable house proposition. In one of these he now lives. He believes his idea will do much to advance the cause. Those who may be interested are invited to communicate with Mr. McCaig and get some explanatory literature that he will be glad to send.

Two books will appear shortly, one by Henry Ware Allen, entitled "Prosperity," to be issued by the Christopher Company of Boston.

Another forthcoming work is entitled "The Road to Prosperity," by Gilbert M. Tucker, to be published by Putnam's Sons of this city. Adequate reviews of both of these works will appear in LAND AND FREEDOM.

*Forbes*, a well known business magazine published in this city, quotes from LAND AND FREEDOM on what we had to say about wages not being drawn from capital.

ROBERT H. JACKSON of Jamestown, N. Y., delivered a remarkable address at the dedication of the High School in that city. Several years ago he made an address in which he quoted extensively from "Progress and Poverty" and on this occasion he wrote a letter to our old friend and veteran in the cause Frank G. Anderson of Jamestown as follows:

"I am always interested to hear from men who have studied George and whether you agree with all his conclusions or not, it must be admitted that he was one of the most profound students of the past century. I am a believer in most of his teachings."

Mr. Jackson is a friend of the son-in-law of Mr. Anderson and has been prominently spoken of for the governorship of the State.

ED DOTY died Nov. 12 at the age of seventy-two, and it is with real sorrow that we chronicle the death of an old friend and correspondent. Ed Doty (he was always called Ed) was for many years a newspaper man and a staunch advocate of the Henry George philosophy. He was clerk of the Ohio House of Representatives for two sessions and was appointed by Newton D. Baker when the latter was mayor, as Secretary of the City Sinking Fund. He was a close friend of Tom L. Johnson. Cleveland has lost a strong advocate of our movement, fearless and uncompromising. He had a keen sense of humor and was a most lovable personality. We shall miss him greatly.

"London's Gold Mine" is a four-page leaflet by Frederick Verinder in which is given instances of the fortunes buried in London sites. The figures are startling enough. A quotation from a speech made by W. E. Gladstone many years ago is arresting and is as follows:

"We have just been driving along your magnificent Embankment. But at whose expense was that great permanent and stable improvement made? Instead of being made, as it should have been, mainly at the expense of the permanent proprietary interests, it was charged, every shilling of it, either upon the wages of the laboring man in fuel necessary for his family, or upon the trade and industry and enterprise which belong of necessity to a vast Metropolis like this."

A VIGOROUS attack on the Townsend Plan appears in *The Broom* of San Diego, Calif. Our congratulations to Brother De Aryan. He is of a type that we might well have more of a brave, uncompromising advocate with a splendid ability to use English.

THE Springfield, Mo., *Leader and Press* contains an account of the formation of a Henry George School in that city. A portrait of Dr. J. V. Boswell, the teacher of the School, accompanies the article. Dr. Boswell is an old time Single Taxer with whom the Schalkenbach Foundation and John Lawrence Monroe recently established contacts. The article, which is a good presentation of our philosophy, quotes Dr. Boswell who is, we believe, an exceptional teacher.

OUR friend Prof. Matheu Alonso of Salamanca, Spain, writes to *La Reforma Social* that on his recent visit to Leningrad he saw but little of any deep-seated poverty. Nevertheless, the people look poor and are poor. Poverty has its various phases and we gather that while there is no starvation there is a dead level of depression among the people, few comforts and no luxuries.

E. W. NICOLAUS, editor of *The Commonweal* of New Zealand has been nominated by the Commonwealth Land Party for representative from East Wellington at the next general elections. Mr. Nicolaus organized the Wayside Club in Wellington in 1931. The club oc-

cupies an entire floor of a large building in which there is a reading room, a class room and a lecture hall. An average of 250 men pass through these rooms daily. We shall give news of the outcome of the campaign which will be watched with interest in many parts of the world outside Wellington.

HON. WILLIAM D. GRIMES, newly appointed City Solicitor of Pittsburgh, Pa., reviewed Albert Jay Nock's recent book, "Our Enemy the State," before the Henry George Club of that city. The same work is reviewed by Harry Weinberger in this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

A LIFE-LONG Henry George disciple, Leland P. Shidy, is dead in Stockton, Calif., at the age of eighty-four. He was for many years head of the Geodetic Survey in Washington. He was considered one of the foremost tidal experts of his time. He was long a subscriber to this paper.

*The Roman Forum* for November, edited by Dr. Frederick W. Roman at Los Angeles, is a notable number. The articles by Dr. Roman are a real contribution to progressive thought. The Henry George School is not neglected and generous portions are allotted to its consideration. The Roman forums are listed and are proofs of the fine constructive work that is in progress.

SUPERIOR JUDGE JOHN M. WILSON of Thurston County, Wash., has enjoined the state tax commission from collecting the sales tax in a suit begun by John D. Morrow who is a Seattle cafe operator. Mr. Morrow is a son of our friend, State Senator Frank P. Morrow. The order restraining the tax commission from using money tokens is on the ground that taxes can be paid only in lawful money.

AN admirable review of Albert Nock's book, "Our Enemy the State," appears from the pen of David Gibson in the *Lorain (O.) Journal* and also in the *Sandusky Daily News* and the *Mansfield News Journal*, all of Ohio.

HON. WILLIAM N. MCNAIR, Mayor of Pittsburgh, addressed a meeting at Fairhope, Ala., early in November. He detailed the progress being made in his city.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY of Tacoma, Wash., writes: "In my judgment you are doing wisely to omit from LAND AND FREEDOM the hair-splitting controversies. We will cross these bridges when we come to them. We have, just now, one great big vital thing to do."

MR. GEORGE E. ROBERTS of the National City Bank has written a fine letter of endorsement to D. L. Thompson, of Spokane, Wash., on the latter's pamphlet "Our Deluded Overproductionists," reviewed in Sept.-Oct. LAND AND FREEDOM.

"DARKEST AFRICA OF ECONOMICS" is the title of a large four-page leaflet by A. A. Whipple, of Wenatchee, Wash.

J. H. KAUFFMAN of Columbus, O., in a letter to the Henry George Congress called attention to a paragraph in the Dictionary of American Biography published in 1931 in which it is said of Henry George that "he was not only perfectly original but accomplished a synthesis and gave his message a singular force and beauty."

N. D. ALFER, who is helping Judge Ralston in his campaign in California, writes: "A topsy-turvy world leans towards isms strange to the ideals of democracy. In a world surcharged with various breeds of dictatorship only a quick reversal in a place known to all the world can charge the tide. California is that place. California will show the way!"

"PERTINENT COMMENT ON MATTERS OF INTEREST" is a feature column in the *Labor Herald* of Wilmington, Del., conducted by the son of Al Saylor founder of the paper and a convinced Henry George man. He writes every week and does not neglect the land question. He says in the issue of Sept. 21: "It is possible to have a great national domain without grabbing land in some backward nation. We have it all about us."

A VERY fair article in the *Recorder* of San Francisco is headed "Another Year Will Say Whether Henry George Has Come to Life." *The Recorder* contains in another column an account from the *New York Times* of the ceremony at the grave of Henry George during the recent Henry George Congress in this city. *The Recorder* heads this "The Single Tax is Very Much With Us."

It is good news that the recent Liberal victory in Canada gave a majority of 100 in a house of 245.

EDWIN I. S. HARDING of Toowong, Queensland, Australia, writes: "It is enough to make the angels laugh through their tears to see Abyssinians and Italians killing each other for land in a territory big enough to lose both armies in a war in which the rank and file have nothing to gain."

E. W. DOTY of Cleveland, in almost the last letter he wrote less than two months ago: "Your stuff this month is your best output."

We have received a very interesting leaflet entitled "Equity—Equal Rights to All," from Mr. Frank Berman of this city. In a general way the leaflet is to be recommended. We would however call attention to his contention regarding the abolition of land titles which is not in accord with Henry George and would after all serve no useful purpose. With the socialization of economic rent it is both permissible and desirable that titles to land remain as at present, or until some better form of giving security of improvements is devised.

MRS. BENJAMIN W. BURGER having expressed her admiration for Mr. Dorn as Director of the Henry George School, saying he was the right man in the right place, her son, young Henry George Burger, spoke up and said: "Of course he was endorsed and recognized from the first, for was he not named O. K. Dorn." Quite a bright boy is young Henry.

ROBERT J. WILLIAMSON of Brooklyn, N. Y., passed away on Sept. 21. He was a veteran of the 1886 campaign and organized the West Side Henry George Club. He was also a member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club. He was interested in the Single Tax colony at Fairhope, Ala., which he visited several times.

AN article well worth reading appears in the October *Scribners*, "King Cotton's Slaves" by C. T. Carpenter who has befriended and defended the cotton croppers. Mr. Carpenter has written a remarkable article involving much careful research. His conclusions appear to us entirely sound.

REV. HERBERT BIGELOW is elected to the City Council in Cincinnati by first-choice vote under the preferential system in operation there. The *Cincinnati Post* gives a long and interesting account of his life and activities.

DORIS KNAPP has a letter in the *St. Louis Star Times* entitled "Poser for Will Durant." It should give some food for thought to that eminent writer and lecturer.

AN interesting interview with Dan Beard appears in the *Nyack (N.Y.) Journal News* of Oct. 26. Mr. Beard says: "Abe Lincoln and



Henry George stood out as the greatest men I ever met. Only two men awed me in my lifetime and these were the two."

It used to be said that land should be free as air. This contention may some day have to be modified for it may be that air will soon be no longer free. The Van Nuys, California, *Tribune* tells us that:

F. R. Hinman and Nannie Hinman today have a suit in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in which they ask \$90,000 damages from the United Air Lines, for use of the air during the past four years.

The contention of the Hinmans is that they own the air above the property just as well as oil and minerals that may be found beneath it.

WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS of Toronto writes: "I have been a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM and previously to the *Single Tax Review* for many years. I feel that a constant perusal of its tenets has helped to guide my convictions through life. I realize that the editing of this wonderful publication must be a more or less thankless task, but it is vital to the promulgation of the truth."

ALFRED M. BINGHAM has a review of Albert Jay Nock's "Our Enemy the State" in *Commonsense* in which he says that "Mr. Nock's enthusiasm for Henry George leads him to ignore the fact that land has become a minor element in the means of production." We should like to know if land is no longer a source of wealth, what is? For God's sake, let us know what is the *major* element to which land is now subordinate, so we can be introduced to it. Mr. Bingham only thinks he is thinking.

IN LaFollette's *Progressive* appears an open letter to the editor from Elizabeth Young George of Cecilville, Calif., headed, "Georgeists Carry On," in which she urges the perusal of LAND AND FREEDOM and other Single Tax periodicals.

IN the *Harvard Hillside* for Oct. 12 appears a two-column article from the pen of Fiske Warren on "The Enclave of Tahanto," in Massachusetts. The article is very interesting and is a valuable contribution to the subject of enclaves to which Mr. Warren has devoted so much of his interest and activity. For the benefit of some of our readers it may be explained that the "enclaves" which Mr. Warren has established in many parts of the world are Single Tax colonies modeled on the Henry George system in so far as local and State laws will permit. These serve as working models and furnish interesting social experiments along the lines of our philosophy.

## World Georgeist Publications

*Aradi Kozlony*—Str. Consistorului 21, Arad, Roumania.  
*A Terra*—Caixa Postal 3064, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.  
*The Broom*—P. O. Box 747, San Diego, Calif., U. S. A.  
*Bodenreform*—Lessingstrasse 11, Berlin, N. W. 87, Germany.  
*The Bulletin*—7 St. Martin's Place, London, W. C. 2, England.  
*The Commonweal*—P. O. Box 1227, Wellington, New Zealand.  
*The Crusader*—Ophir, Oregon, U. S. A.  
*De Nieuwe Aarde*—Stoombootpad 183, Amsterdam, Holland.  
*Det Frie Blad*—Store Kongensgade 60, Copenhagen, K, Denmark.  
*Fairhope Courier*—Fairhope, Alabama, U. S. A.  
*The Forum*—1325 E. Poplar Street, Stockton, Calif., U. S. A.  
*Grundskyld*—Monradsvej. 15, Copenhagen, Denmark.  
*Henry George Fellowship News*—7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.  
*Justice and Freedom*—care of Mr. E. F. Lane, J. P., Tullibigeal, N. S. Wales, Australia.  
*LAND AND FREEDOM*—150 Nassau Street, New York City, U. S. A.  
*The Liberator*—Kolamunda, Perth, West Australia.  
*The Liberator*—101 Victoria Arcade, Auckland, New Zealand.  
*No Taxes*—1325 E. Poplar Street, Stockton, Calif., U. S. A.  
*O Georgeista*—Caixa Postal 514, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

*People's Advocate*—George Parade, 11 Carrington Street, Adelaide, Australia.

*The Porcupine*—69 Piccadilly, Manchester, England.

*Progress*—18 George Parade, Melbourne, Australia.

*Recht En Vrijheid*—Princessweg 77, Groningen, Holland.

*La Reforma Social*—Velazquez 98, Madrid, Spain.

*Restats Bladet*—Munkegade 3. Aarhus, Denmark.

*Social Wealth*—48 St. George's Terrace, Perth, West Australia.

*The Standard*—114 Hunter Street, Australia.

*Tax Facts*—333 N. Madison Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.

*Terre Et Liberte*—29 Boulevard Bourdon, Paris IVE, France.

*Land and Liberty*—94 Petty France, London, S. W. 1. England.

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Act of Congress of March 3, 1933, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published bi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for October, 1935.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Dana Miller, who, having been duly sworn, according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor and managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Managing Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Business Manager: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

2. That the owners are: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., Herman G. Loew, Pres., George R. Macey, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, New York City. None but Joseph Dana Miller own one per cent. or more of stock.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,

EDITOR.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 23d day of September, 1935.  
 [Seal] MORRIS ROSENZWEIG, Notary Public.

Bronx County.

# YOU CAN HELP MAKE 100,000 GEORGEISTS

That's the goal—100,000 dyed-in-the-wool, thoroughly informed, properly recorded Georgeists. It can be done—with your help. We know now how it can be done by teaching "Progress and Poverty." Simple, isn't it? No elaborate schemes—just the simple procedure of getting a group together each week, for ten weeks, to discuss with you each chapter of this great book. At the end of that short period every student becomes a real enthusiast. It has been proven.

## Start a Class Now

It's easy—and interesting. Call up a few friends and tell them that on, let's say, next Monday night, at 8 p.m. you are starting a class in Fundamental Economics—so that they can know the real cause of poverty, the real cure for depressions. Tell them to bring their friends. At your home, your office, in a public building—anywhere. All you need is a "Teacher's Manual"—a wonderful book giving suggestions on how to run a class, questions and answers covering every chapter in "Progress and Poverty." The "Manual" costs you One Dollar—and that's all the expense involved.

## Free Class Room Helps

The School will furnish you free the following, which you will find helpful in conducting your class.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Enrollment and Attendance Cards.                   | 6. Book - Marks (with definitions).                  |
| 2. Triple-Postcard Announcements. (Write for sample). | 7. Lesson Assignments for Distribution to Students.  |
| 3. Posters.   | 8. Graduation Certificates.                          |
| 4. Class Enrollment Sheet.                            | 9. Charter of Henry George School of Social Science. |
| 5. Questionnaires—for creating interest.              |  |

## Don't Delay -- Do It Now

You know what's wrong with the world today. You owe it to yourself, to your country, to start teaching—NOW.

FOR FURTHER DETAILS WRITE

## Henry George School of Social Science

CHARTERED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

211 WEST 79TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

For your business friends who need to know about  
land value taxation

## SAFEGUARD PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL

This little book shows how productive industry is crushed between the upper millstone of high taxes and the lower millstone of ground rent,—and the only way in which business can possibly find relief. Don't argue with your business friend. Give him a copy.

"Will be read by many who have not the intellectual capacity, nor perhaps the leisure, to examine what Henry George really taught."  
—Joseph Dana Miller, in LAND AND FREEDOM.

"A sensible suggestion at a time when big business and small business as well is crying for relief from heavy taxation. . . . Seems to fit the picture of what industry needs today."  
—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

"Non-technical and should interest anyone who is concerned with reducing taxes on industry."  
—*New York Investment News*.

The book is by LOUIS WALLIS, author of "The Struggle for Justice" and other volumes dealing with economic forces in world history.

All booksellers, 75 cents

DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & CO.

Garden City, Long Island, N. Y.

## What to Emphasize in Teaching the Georgeist Philosophy

Mr. Burger's great address at the recent

## Henry George Conference

in New York City, which appears in this issue, will be reprinted as a pamphlet if sufficient orders are received by the editor.

Send 10 cents a copy with orders for ten or more copies.

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK CITY

ut

ee

nd

nd

py

ty

t'

es-

fr

.

th

fr

r'

-

er

er

er

er

er

er

er

er

er

er





